

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, November 10, 1995

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. HAYWORTH].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC.
November 10, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable J.D. HAYWORTH to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

With so many words to be said and so much that needs to be accomplished, we pray, O God, for integrity in our inner beings and a forthright attitude in our hearts. The conflicts and differences of our ideas can cause us to speak in ways that do not contribute to our shared goals and we are not heard. We pray that our eyes will be open to the truth, our ears will hear what is spoken, and our words will point the way to justice, for by so doing we will be messengers of the wonders of all creation and faithful workers in our land. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. STEARNS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2589. An act to extend authorities under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994 until December 31, 1995, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2394. An act to increase, effective as of December 1, 1995, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans;

H.R. 2586. An act to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 115. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 848. An act to grant the consent of Congress to an amendment of the Historic Chatahoochee Compact between the States of Alabama and Georgia; and

S.J. Res. 29. Joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to North-South dialogue on the Korean Peninsula and the United States-North Korea Agreed Framework.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain ten 1-minute speeches on each side.

LEAVE OUR CHILDREN THE AMERICAN DREAM, NOT THE AMERICAN DEBT

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, do you see this? This is a piggy bank. Not a normal piggy bank that we would expect most American children to have. This is a piggy bank the American children are going to need to have to fill with \$187,000 over their lifetime. It is going to be for their share of the interest on the national debt if we do not balance the budget soon.

We are imprisoning our children, and theirs, by continuing to pile more and more debt on their backs. What we want to do for our children, and for their children, is to leave them the American dream, not the American debt.

Mr. Speaker, the President offers no plan. The President offers no leadership. It is unfortunate that the President has left nothing but our choice to bring this Government to a halt to save the future for our children.

VETERANS DAY

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, November 11, is Veterans Day, which means honoring all veterans who fought in all of the wars so that we could have this great freedom in our country today because of our veterans.

Also, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow ends a 4-year celebration of the 50th anniversary of World War II. On November 11, here in the Washington area, we will honor the war dead at Arlington cemetery. Then that afternoon, a groundbreaking of a World War II Memorial will take place.

Mr. Speaker, this will be a site between the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial. It will be like the Vietnam Memorial, like the Korean Memorial. It will be honoring the World War II veterans that fought in the largest war that we ever had. November 11 is very, very important to the people of this country.

THE PRESIDENT HAS A CHOICE

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, the President has a choice to make. He can help us balance the budget and save the country, or he can close the Government down. This is not brain surgery. The President has a choice. Unfortunately, I am concerned that for political reasons, the President will make the wrong choice.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Yesterday, instead of asking to meet with Congress to try to figure out how to work this out, the President chose instead to meet with his Cabinet Members to figure out the logistics to shutting the Government down.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have passed a plan to balance the budget. The President, however, offered us no leadership, no plan, and no choice, and that is a real shame.

PRESIDENT IS DUE EXPLANATION FROM SECRETARY OF ENERGY

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Wall Street Journal broke a story contending that the Secretary of Energy has spent \$43,500 to evaluate news services and reporters' coverage of her and her Department.

Mr. Speaker, I serve on the oversight committee, the Committee on Science, where we have been trying to reposition and reevaluate the Energy Department to make cuts for a balanced budget by the year 2002 in a bipartisan way.

This is inexcusable that \$43,000 is spent in this kind of manner. That is as much as the average American family earns in a year, plus \$10,000. I understand she is meeting with the President this morning and I would encourage the President that if he does not get straight answers and a good rationale for this decision, that he get the Secretary's resignation.

IN EXTRAORDINARY TIMES, EXTRAORDINARY MEASURES ARE REQUIRED

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, let me read a quotation from May 28, 1992, and ask you who said this:

Democrats have warned that the day of reckoning was upon us. Now it is here. Our country cannot function with an annual \$400 billion deficit, and in these extraordinary times, extraordinary measures are required.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], that is what the gentleman said on May 28, 1992. Now, these are tough measures, but as the minority leader said, in extraordinary times, extraordinary measures are required.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to balance the budget, we are going to cut taxes, we are going to save Medicare, and we are going to reform welfare, too.

The bills we have sent to the President on Monday are going down as a downpayment on these efforts. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the President offers no leadership, no plan, and no choice.

CHINA SELLING NUCLEAR MATERIALS TO IRAN

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that China enjoys most-favored-nation trade status with America. Everybody knows that China enjoys a \$40 billion-plus trade surplus with America. But check this out. The Pentagon says China is selling nuclear weapons to Iran.

The Pentagon says no matter how hard they try, China just does not want to listen. The Pentagon says China just will not cooperate, and the Pentagon says we just cannot do anything about China.

Mr. Speaker, why not send some Pittsburgh Steelers crying towels over to the Pentagon? The truth is Washington is so screwed up, while the Government in America may be shutting down, China is selling nuclear capabilities to Iran and ripping off American workers.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. There is no intelligent life left here.

CASE HAS NOT BEEN MADE FOR SENDING TROOPS TO BOSNIA

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, Bill Clinton wants to send 20,000 Americans to Bosnia. He wants to send them there for 1 year, although many experts say if we get on the ground there, we will be there at least 10 years. He wants to send us into a situation where there will be hostile forces on all sides. He wants us to be in the middle of centuries-old animosities.

Mr. Speaker, into this cauldron he wants to send 20,000 young Americans. Do not think of this in the abstract. That is too easy. Personalize it a little bit. We must think of it as if they were our children, our brothers, our sisters.

Mr. Speaker, I have three daughters. Can I go to Janna and say, "Janna, it is important for America for you to go to Bosnia"? "Lori, for a better America, I want you in Bosnia"? "Juli, the country needs you in Bosnia"?

Bill Clinton, look into Chelsea's eyes and say "Chelsea, for the future of America, we want you in Bosnia." Mr. Speaker, if we would not send our own kids over there, we should not send other people's kids over there. The case has not been made for wasting one of these young lives.

ADVICE TO PRESIDENT CLINTON

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, now we see the capstone of the Gingrich revolution. The Gingrich revolution started with the Contract With America. We debated 31 bills for 100 days. Three were signed into law.

Then, the Republicans were 1 month late with their budget resolution; late with their appropriation bills. We find ourselves with a stopgap spending bill going through, and then they pushed through the Medicare rate increase on seniors and the tax break for the wealthy and said to the President, "Take it or leave it."

Mr. Speaker, I am saying to the President, "Leave it. Veto these Republican plans to raise Medicare premiums and provide tax cuts for wealthy Americans."

We are now facing a shutdown of the Government because Speaker GINGRICH's political strategy calls for this High Noon scenario. This is a complete abdication of responsibility by the leadership in this House of Representatives. It is shameful. It will penalize American families. If this is the Gingrich revolution, keep it.

STOP THE EXCUSES AND BALANCE THE BUDGET

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the President met with his Cabinet yesterday to discuss the logistics of shutting down the Government. I have a suggestion for the President—instead of meeting with your Cabinet, maybe you could make some time to meet with congressional leaders to discuss balancing the budget.

Mr. Speaker, as a candidate, Bill Clinton promised to balance the budget. While President, he has stated that he supports a plan that balances the budget in 5, 7, 9, even 10 years. But yet he has shown no leadership, has presented no plan, and has given us no choice.

The Republican majority has a plan to balance the budget in 7 years. It is time for the Clinton Democrats to stop the excuses and balance the budget. It is the right thing to do for our children's future.

THE PRESIDENT, THE SPEAKER, AND WARTY BLIGGENS

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the silly flap about whether the President paid enough attention to the Speaker on Air Force One reminds me of a poem written by my favorite philosopher, Archy the Cockroach.

It goes as follows:
i met a toad

the other day by the name
of warty bliggens
he was sitting under
a toadstool
feeling contented
he explained that when the cosmos
was created
that toadstool was especially
planned for his personal
shelter from sun and rain
thought out and prepared
for him

do not tell me
said warty bliggens
that there is not a purpose
in the universe
the thought is blasphemy
a little more
conversation revealed
that warty bliggens
considers himself to be
the center of the said
universe
the earth exists
to grow toadstools for him
to sit under
the sun to give him light
by day, and the moon
and wheeling constellations
to make beautiful
the night all for the sake of
warty bliggens

WHAT IS THE OBJECTIVE IN BOSNIA?

(Mr. METCALF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, in the next few days this House will make a momentous decision: Shall the United States commit ground troops to Bosnia? The President has the constitutional power to commit troops, but Congress has the constitutional duty to fund that commitment or to refuse to fund that commitment. Before we make that decision, the President has an obligation to tell the Congress what is the objective, what vital United States interests are threatened.

□ 0915

What will those troops do to protect any vital United States interest if they are threatened there? Just as one Member of this Congress, I for one will not vote any money to send ground troops to Bosnia until those questions are satisfactorily answered.

KEYSTONE KOPS MENTALITY

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, here in Newtland a true Keystone Kops mentality has taken full control. The zealots have lost all reality. They tell America to pay any price, even default in order to accomplish their agenda.

Yes, we have Chief NEWT and a zillion little Keystone zealots chasing each other around the Capitol. The House Republicans cannot agree with the Senate Republicans. This morning the

House Republicans cannot even agree with each other about what their agenda is or their schedule is, but they are willing to put the full faith and credit of the most important Nation in the entire world on the line and risk that despite our history of paying our debts.

Let them listen to one of their own Republican colleagues, the gentleman from New York who said, and quote: I think the whole thing is nuts. Nobody knows the potential impact. If you play this hand and lose, you can really do a lot of damage. It is like threatening to explode a time bomb in your own backyard. That is the mentality that controls: Gingrichism, excellence in pursuit of error.

ENERGY SECRETARY O'LEARY

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, Energy Secretary O'Leary wasted over 43,000 taxpayer dollars to compile an enemies list which included some Members of this Chamber. If any Member of Congress had taken the taxpayers' dollars and spent them in such a blatant self-serving manner, they would have been run out of office, and rightfully so.

At a time when we are making tough choices to balance the budget, it is the height of irresponsibility for Secretary O'Leary to be wasting money like that.

One of the targets of her investigation, Senate Majority Leader DOLE, said the whole thing was a shocking waste of taxpayer dollars.

I was also a target of this investigation. I think it is an abuse of the American taxpayers themselves. After all, this administration has been mired in one ethical scandal after another: Whitewater, Travelgate, Webb Hubbell, Ron Brown. The list goes on and on.

While the administration warns of an impending financial default which could put 800,000 Government workers on unemployment, it is clear that there has been an ethical default of almost 3 years. It is time for Secretary O'Leary to find gainful employment outside the U.S. Government.

ACCESS TO THE SPEAKER'S OFFICE

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal says it all this morning: Donald Jones, a wealthy backer of House Speaker NEWT GINGRICH, has taken the concept of being a Washington insider to new heights. The Wisconsin telecommunications entrepreneur enjoyed unusual access to the Speaker as House leaders fine-tuned a sweeping telecommunications bill earlier this year.

This gentleman has millions or billions of dollars' worth of financial interests before this House, and we find out that he spoke often 2 to 3 hours daily with the Speaker of the House.

This is the way Mr. Jones describes his access: I participate as an observer. I interpret and I analyze the subtleties of the meeting for the Speaker.

In the end, on this bill, this bill treated both the Internet and cable services in which Mr. Jones has a tremendous financial interest favorably by deregulating rates, among other things. The clincher is Mr. GINGRICH opposed an amendment in being soft on pornography on the cable channels. Do you know that? Mr. Jones, 40 percent of his gross is involved with the pornography channel.

The American people did not vote last November for this kind of change.

BLAME GAME IS OVER

(Mr. JONES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, the Government has not balanced its books since 1969. Since then, we have had 26 years of excuses, 26 years of Washington gimmicks, and 26 years of righteous indignation about balancing the budget.

Well, the blame game is over.

Congress has reached the end of the excuses. Our balance budget lays aside the gimmicks and the shell games. We can no longer ignore the impact of deficit spending on our children. It would be nothing less than moral irresponsibility to look our children in the eye and say to them, that they should continue to shoulder our burdens because we do not have the guts to do what is right.

Mr. Speaker, the President has two clear choices. He can choose a balanced budget and secure a brighter future for all Americans, or he can choose a dark future for our families and our children.

MR. JONES AND THE SPEAKER

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, how many more times do the Members of this House and the public have to pick up the newspaper and see a new ethical transgression by the Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH? Once again, we are treated in the Wall Street Journal to NEWT GINGRICH mixing campaign contributions, private interests, and public service. We now see that Mr. Donald Jones served as an adviser to Mr. GINGRICH 2 or 3 hours a day to interpret the telecommunications bill to him while he gave Mr. GINGRICH, his PAC gave the Republican Party \$125,000, \$25,000 to the Gingrich PAC.

It turns out that, not only did Mr. Jones have a financial interest in the outcome of the telecommunications bill, he was sitting in the Speaker's office, but also when many of us were startled when the Speaker took a position against the cyberporn portions of the telecommunications bill to protect children from pornography. We now find out that Mr. Jones had a financial interest in the telecommunications company that was dealing with pornography and adult films. Mr. Jones said he did not know. Forty percent of his income from that company came from pornography. Mr. Speaker, clean up your office.

THE MOST INVESTIGATED ADMINISTRATION IN HISTORY

(Mr. HOKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, just when we thought that the poor judgment or the ethical standards of the Clinton administration could not get any worse, along comes the revelation yesterday that Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary paid \$43,000 in taxpayers' money to compile what amounts to an enemies list. For that, the Secretary should resign immediately.

Secretary O'Leary joins a long list of other Clinton administration figures who have helped make this probably the most investigated administration in history: Deputy Attorney General Webb Hubbell, Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown, Secretary of Agriculture, Mike Espy, Secretary of HUD, Henry Cisneros, Treasury official Jean Hansen, White House lawyers William Kennedy and Bernie Nussbaum and resident egghead Ira Magaziner, the Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, Roger Altman, not to mention White Whitewater. And who can forget poor Josh Steiner, the former Treasury official who testified that he lied to his own diary. Perhaps most important and embarrassing is the unprecedented legal defense fund for a sitting President.

Yet this same administration has the nerve to lecture us about balancing the budget.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority want to shut down Government because they cannot pass their bill that is loaded up like a Christmas tree. They have not passed the majority of the appropriations bills, and they are over 40 days late.

So what are we going to see? Social Security claims will not be paid. Veter-

ans' benefit checks delayed. National parks closed.

The Republican majority has told the President and the American people, it is our way or no way. Well, the voters sent the message last Tuesday and by the polls show that by 2 to 1 they are rejecting the Republican extremism.

We support a balanced budget, but not at the expense of cutting Medicare, education funds, and student loans.

LAY ASIDE GIMMICKS

(Mrs. SEASTRAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, our opponents like to come to the floor and say the most outrageous things about what is going on here in Congress. Over and over we hear words such as extremists, zealots, and terrorists. This from the same party who constantly demand civility in public life.

Now, many on the other side know that we have to get control of the budget. Many of them have voted for a balanced budget amendment. In their heart of hearts, they know we have to balance the budget. But, unfortunately, most of our opponents lack the basic will to say "no." They would rather go on spending more and more taxpayer dollars on inefficient programs than lose the support of a particular liberal special interest group.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to lay aside the excuses and the gimmicks and all the talk about extremist and zealots. Let us balance the budget. It is the right thing to do for the American people and the future of this great Nation. Let's just do it.

MORE ON GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, regrettably on Tuesday I think the unthinkable may well happen. That is, first of all, the shutdown of the Federal Government. It did not have to be this way. Nor did it have to be that the Nation's economy would needlessly be endangered by a possible default on the debt ceiling.

There ought to be two bills passed here that are called clean. One that simply extends the funding for the Federal Government for another couple of weeks while negotiations on a balanced budget take place, and the second bill, a clean bill, simply permits the Government to continue borrowing to pay back bills, not future spending.

But regrettably, because extremists in this House have insisted on loading on unacceptable provisions such as an increase in Medicare part B premiums and other provisions, these will have to

be vetoed. The President will really have no choice and so we have come to this crunch.

Thousands of Federal employees in West Virginia and the eastern panhandle and across the Nation will be furloughed. Millions of citizens will be inconvenienced as Government services are shut down and, worst of all, by taking them hostage, the economy of this country can be endangered.

It does not have to be this way, Mr. Speaker, nor should it be.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question de novo of the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 299, nays 84, answered "present" 1, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 782]

YEAS—299

Andrews	Chabot	Dunn
Archer	Chambliss	Edwards
Armey	Chapman	Ehlers
Bachus	Chenoweth	Ehrlich
Baesler	Christensen	Emerson
Baker (CA)	Chrysler	Engel
Baker (LA)	Clayton	English
Baldacci	Clement	Eshoo
Ballenger	Clinger	Evans
Barr	Coble	Ewing
Barrett (WI)	Collins (GA)	Fattah
Bartlett	Collins (IL)	Fawell
Barton	Collins (MI)	Flake
Bass	Combest	Foley
Beilenson	Condit	Ford
Bentsen	Conyers	Fowler
Bereuter	Cooley	Fox
Berman	Coyne	Franks (NJ)
Bevill	Cramer	Frelinghuysen
Blibray	Crapo	Frisa
Billirakis	Creameans	Funderburk
Bliley	Cubin	Gallegly
Boehlt	Cunningham	Ganske
Boehner	Danner	Cejdenson
Bonilla	Davis	Gekas
Bono	de la Garza	Geren
Brewster	Deal	Gilchrest
Browder	DeFazio	Gilman
Brown (OH)	DeLauro	Gonzalez
Brownback	DeLay	Goodlatte
Bryant (TN)	Dellums	Goodling
Bryant (TX)	Deutsch	Gordon
Bunn	Diaz-Balart	Goss
Bunning	Dicks	Graham
Burr	Doggett	Green
Burton	Dooley	Greenwood
Callahan	Doolittle	Gunderson
Calvert	Dorman	Hall (TX)
Camp	Doyle	Hamilton
Canady	Dreier	Hancock
Castle	Duncan	Hansen

Hastert	McCarthy	Ros-Lehtinen
Hastings (WA)	McCollum	Roth
Hayes	McCrery	Roukema
Hayworth	McDade	Roybal-Allard
Herger	McHale	Royce
Hobson	McInnis	Salmon
Hoekstra	McIntosh	Sanders
Hoke	McKeon	Sanford
Holden	McKinney	Sawyer
Horn	McNulty	Saxton
Hostettler	Meehan	Scarborough
Houghton	Metcalf	Schaefer
Hoyer	Meyers	Schiff
Hunter	Mica	Schumer
Hutchinson	Miller (FL)	Seastrand
Hyde	Minge	Sensenbrenner
Inglis	Mink	Serrano
Istook	Moakley	Shadegg
Jackson-Lee	Mollinari	Shaw
Johnson (CT)	Mollohan	Shays
Johnson (SD)	Montgomery	Sisisky
Johnson, Sam	Moorhead	Skeen
Jones	Moran	Skelton
Kanjorski	Morella	Slaughter
Kasich	Murtha	Smith (MI)
Kelly	Myers	Smith (NJ)
Kennedy (MA)	Myrick	Smith (TX)
Kennelly	Nethercutt	Smith (WA)
Kildee	Neumann	Solomon
Kim	Ney	Souder
King	Norwood	Spence
Kingston	Nussle	Spratt
Klecza	Obey	Stearns
Klink	Oliver	Stokes
Knollenberg	Ortiz	Stump
Kolbe	Oxley	Talent
LaHood	Packard	Tate
Lantos	Pallone	Tauzin
Largent	Parker	Taylor (NC)
LaTourette	Pastor	Thomas
Laughlin	Paxon	Thornberry
Lazio	Payne (VA)	Tiahrt
Leach	Pelosi	Torres
Lewis (KY)	Petri	Upton
Lightfoot	Pomeroy	Vento
Lincoln	Porter	Vucanovich
Linder	Portman	Waldholtz
Lipinski	Pryce	Walker
Livingston	Quinn	Walsh
LoBlundo	Rahall	Ward
Lofgren	Ramstad	Watts (OK)
Lowey	Rangel	Weldon (FL)
Lucas	Reed	White
Luther	Regula	Wicker
Manton	Rivers	Wyden
Manzullo	Roberts	Wynn
Martini	Roemer	Young (FL)
Mascara	Rogers	Zeliff
Matsui	Rohrabacher	

NAYS—84

Abercrombie	Gillmor	Payne (NJ)
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Pombo
Allard	Gutknecht	Poshard
Barcia	Hall (OH)	Rush
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Sabo
Bishop	Hefley	Schroeder
Bonior	Hefner	Scott
Brown (CA)	Heineman	Skaggs
Brown (FL)	Hilleary	Stenholm
Clay	Hilliard	Stockman
Clyburn	Hinchey	Stupak
Coburn	Jacobs	Tanner
Coleman	Jefferson	Taylor (MS)
Costello	Johnson, E. B.	Thompson
Crane	Kennedy (RI)	Thurman
Durbin	Latham	Torkildsen
Ensign	Levin	Trafigant
Everett	Lewis (GA)	Velazquez
Fazio	Longley	Visclosky
Filner	Maloney	Wamp
Flanagan	Markey	Waters
Foglietta	McDermott	Watt (NC)
Forbes	Meek	Whitfield
Franks (CT)	Menendez	Wise
Frost	Miller (CA)	Wolf
Furse	Neal	Woolsey
Gephardt	Oberstar	Yates
Gibbons	Orton	Zimmer

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Harman

NOT VOTING—48

Barrett (NE)	Kaptur	Rose
Bateman	Klug	Shuster
Blute	LaFalce	Stark
Borski	Lewis (CA)	Studds
Boucher	Martinez	Tejeda
Buyer	McHugh	Thornton
Cardin	Mfume	Torricelli
Cox	Nadler	Towns
Dickey	Owens	Tucker
Dingell	Peterson (FL)	Volkmer
Dixon	Peterson (MN)	Waxman
Farr	Pickett	Weldon (PA)
Fields (LA)	Quillen	Weller
Fields (TX)	Radanovich	Williams
Frank (MA)	Richardson	Wilson
Johnston	Riggs	Young (AK)

□ 0952

Mr. WAMP changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. FAZIO of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I would be more than happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], if he could indicate to our colleagues what we are about to engage in today. Members are seeking leadership.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman will yield, I am happy to inform my friend that we are about to embark on debate on the rule for the continuing resolution, and we hope that we can move quickly through that, have a vote, and then proceed with the continuing resolution. Then we will proceed with the rule on the debt-ceiling increase, move through that quickly, and then have a vote.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Does the gentleman assume these efforts will be to send directly to the President the product of the Senate, or are we going to conference on these matters?

Mr. DREIER. I am not in a position to answer that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Is there anyone on the gentleman's side who could tell us? We just simply, for purposes of Members' schedules, wanted to know whether we were going to try to send to the President the product of today's efforts, or whether we are simply going back to conference on these matters.

Mr. DREIER. To whom would my friend like to yield?

Mr. FAZIO of California. I would be more than happy to yield.

Mr. DREIER. To whom would he like to yield?

Mr. FAZIO of California. I would be more than happy to yield to anyone who could tell us.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] perhaps?

Mr. DREIER. I do not know if he is on the floor. That was the schedule we

have right now. I know there are Members anxious to get home for this very important local day. If we could proceed with consideration of this rule, we will get started.

Mr. FAZIO of California. We will be more than happy to proceed.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman will yield further, I have just been informed here that we are going to be doing the rules back to back, and then we will take up the continuing resolution on the debt ceiling, following consideration of both.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Would it be possible for the leadership to inform us after the two rules are dealt with as to what the intention of the majority is?

Mr. DREIER. We will look forward to the gentleman's inquiry at that time.

Mr. FAZIO of California. We look forward to the gentleman's response.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO DISPOSE OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 115, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 261 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 261

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 115) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, with any Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House a motion offered by the majority leader or his designee to dispose of all Senate amendments. Any Senate amendments and motions shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except any such demand made by the majority leader or his designee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Woodland Hills, California [Mr. BEILENSEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration in the House, without intervening point of order, of a motion if offered by the majority leader or his designee to dispose of Senate amendments to House Joint Resolution 115, a continuing resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 1996 through December 1, 1995.

This rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees, and further provides that the previous question is ordered to adoption of the motion without intervening motion or demand for a division of the question unless the demand is made by the majority leader or his designee.

Mr. Speaker, a short-term continuing resolution is necessary to continue Government operations while we complete the appropriations bills that will put the Federal Government on the 7-year path to a balanced budget. As the Chairman of the Federal Reserve recently said, this effort to come to grips with our chronic and unsustainable Federal deficits is truly extraordinary. It will result in tangible benefits for every American family in the coming years.

While the protectors of big government continue to hold hope deep in their hearts that we will fail, they will be disappointed. It is simply not acceptable for this Congress to fail as our predecessors have. We will not mortgage the future of our children with trillions of dollars of debt.

We will also not apologize for taking time to balance the budget. Past Congresses relied on continuing resolutions on many occasions. There is no question of competence. Instead, ask what Congress is doing with the time a continuing resolution provides. When those on the other side of the aisle controlled this House, they needed time to find enough ways to spend this country \$5 trillion into the hole.

Be assured, if we didn't care about the future of this country, and we agreed with the President's proposition that we just spend enough to avoid tough decisions, we wouldn't need extra time.

Mr. Speaker, the single most important aspect of this continuing resolution is that it is fiscally sound. Funding is lower than the current continuing resolution and below fiscal year 1995. It creates the proper environment to negotiate the outstanding appropriations bills. While disposing of the amendments with the Senate is important, the overriding issue to get this continuing resolution in place by next Monday so that the stage is set to complete our historic budget work.

Mr. Speaker, we must keep our eyes set on our ultimate goals. We will balance the Federal budget, save the Medicare system for a generation of retirees, end welfare as we know it, and implement a tax cut for families that increases the take-home-pay of American workers.

This rule will permit the House to resolve the remaining differences on this continuing resolution so that next week we can get back to accomplishing those critical goals. I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

□ 1000

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] for yielding the customary half-hour of debate time to me.

Mr. Speaker, our lack of opposition to the rule is in no way any lack of indication of our strong and strenuous opposition to the continuing resolution it would make it order.

We support the rule because we believe that passing it is the responsible thing to do. We should move decisively now to set the stage for eventually passing a simple, clean bill, with no extraneous provisions or certainly no controversial ones, that continues Government spending.

Mr. Speaker, we should not even be debating this rule this morning. This is a beginning of Veterans Day weekend. We should be in our districts observing this important occasion. I am sure most of us assumed we would be and have commitments, in fact, to do. But the Republican-controlled Congress has been unable to do its most basic job: passing appropriations bills. This is the only reason we are here considering this resolution under these unusual circumstances and not back home where we all planned to be.

This continuing resolution replaces 11 regular appropriations bills, which by all standards should have been sent to the President for his signature by now. The fact is that most of those yet to be approved have been delayed because of nongermane, extraneous, irrelevant legislative provisions that the majority allowed to be included in appropriations bills, despite the fact they had to waive our rules to do so.

Mr. Speaker, our rules prohibit legislation, policy matters, in appropriations bills for a good reason. We know it is difficult to avoid doing that entirely, but the provisions we are discussing today are major and very controversial. They are, in fact, causing intractable disagreements between Republican Members of the other body, and Republican Members of this House.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to be doing today what we could have done earlier this week: voting on a continuing appropriations measure that is a clean, straightforward extension of funding for the Government until the remaining 11 regular appropriations bills are passed and signed into law, so that our Government can continue to function.

Unfortunately, we will again be denied that opportunity and the Government will no doubt be unnecessarily shut down on Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats are willing and ready to expedite the business of this House. We oppose this continuing resolution that has been burdened

by the Republican leadership with extraneous and controversial provisions, including restriction on the right of nonprofit groups that accept any Federal money to engage in political advocacy, even with their own funds. That language, no matter how much the other body tried to soften it, has no business being included in this resolution. It should be voted on separately in the normal course of legislative business like any other legislative proposal.

The Republican leadership is obviously keeping this most controversial provision in a simple bill to mollify and placate a minority in the House, but what we need now is leadership and political courage. This action, the action that we are being asked to take today, is unworthy of the Republican leadership and calculated to prevent the bill from being signed into law by the President.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the President will not accept the Istook language and the other extraneous provisions that do not belong in the bill. The White House has made that quite clear.

What we are doing today is unduly extending a process that can and should be expedited. We should not be including the provision affecting the Medicare part B premium increase in the bill. That is a matter being addressed in the budget reconciliation bill, and that is where this provision making permanent changes in law belongs.

Mr. Speaker, it is totally irresponsible to be playing these political games that threaten a costly shutdown of the Government. If the majority is seriously interested in preventing this action, and in doing that in the most expeditious manner possible, it will reconsider its decision to bring this encumbered legislation to the floor again.

We should, as I said, be voting on a clean, unencumbered, straightforward continuing resolution. If one were before us, it would pass easily. We Democrats have made it clear that we would vote for it; we are confident a great many Republicans would also do so.

Mr. Speaker, that is the only action that will give our Committee on Appropriations members time to resolve with the Senate and with the President most, if not all, of the remaining differences that they have on the remaining appropriations bills.

We could be doing that today if the majority really wanted to get down to attending to the Nation's business. The country is waiting for some political leadership and for us to end these types of political games.

Mr. Speaker, we urge our colleagues to do the right thing: To reject the continuing resolution this rule makes in order, so that we can instead act seriously and responsibly. Then, and only

then, will we be carrying out our duty to govern this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, so that we can move ahead as expeditiously as possible, at this time we have no requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this continuing resolution is one of the most ridiculous, unnecessary, partisan games I've seen in all my years in Congress. The sole purpose of a continuing resolution is to keep the Government running while Congress works to pass the appropriations bills. A continuing resolution should not be used to further a political agenda. A continuing resolution should not be used to blackmail the President. A continuing resolution should not be trifled with.

Mr. Speaker, a continuing resolution should be clean and bipartisan, plain and simple.

But this continuing resolution is not, it is full of Republican extras that have no place on a bill as serious as this one.

It is the duty of the majority party to govern, and sometimes that means putting aside political games. And sometimes that means putting the interests of the American people before anything else.

I urge my colleagues defeat this rule.

Come back with a clean continuing resolution so that we can get back to the business of governing this country. That is what we were sent here to do.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. I would ask the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], who is managing the rule on our side. Is it not true that the Republicans in the Senate and the House have stubbornly refused to drop the increase in the part B premium on Medicare, so that that will be established at 31 percent rather than being permitted to drop to 25 percent as in current law?

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FROST. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I am afraid what the gentleman has said is quite true.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would ask the gentleman if what this means, of course, is that senior citizens, instead of next year paying \$42 a month for their part B, will

pay \$53 a month for their part B, an increase of \$11 per month, and this is on a glidepath that the Republicans are following that will take part B, premiums to \$87 a month by the year 2002, instead of \$60 a month as in current law, which means that senior citizens will be paying \$27 more per month if we follow this strategy to its conclusion?

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman again is quite correct.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, these increases in Medicare part B are totally unnecessary. The increases are being used to go to the general fund, not to provide for the solvency of Medicare, and are being used to fund the tax cut being proposed by the other side.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would again say that I know my colleagues would like to get back to their districts so that they can deal with the pressing needs of Veterans Day ceremonies. For that reason, I reserve the balance of my time, and hope that we can expeditiously move ahead here.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I say to my friend from California, if he and his friends over there cared that much about getting us home on time on Veterans Day, there are ways of doing it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, the reason we are here today in this session, in this House, in this city, is because of the failure of the Republican leadership to pass appropriation bills on time.

Mr. Speaker, now they come to us with a continuing resolution to keep government in business, but they add a kicker. They will not allow the Federal Government to stay in business unless we agree to raise Medicare premiums on the elderly by 25 percent.

Speaker GINGRICH is determined to raise Medicare premiums to cut the Medicare program. That is his agenda. He has said to the President of the United States, "We will not allow Government to stay in business, unless you will raise Medicare premiums."

Mr. Speaker, we are counting on the President of the United States to veto this bill; to stand up for American families and American seniors. We can go ahead today and defeat the rule. We can defeat this CR, but the final judgment will come in the White House when the President is forced to veto this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I hope at that point that Speaker GINGRICH will ease up on the elderly of this country and move forward to a bipartisan approach.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, in honor of America's veterans and those Members who hope to participate in ceremonies in their districts, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the distinguished ranking mem-

ber of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that Members are impatient to get out of here, but pardon me, there is the public's business to be done. I do not make any apology whatsoever for taking a couple of minutes to talk about that public business.

Mr. Speaker, I think what is happening today is truly sad, and I think it is an example of why this Congress is held in such low esteem by the general public.

In November, I think the American people put the Republican Party in charge of both the House and the Senate because they honestly thought that that would force both parties to get over their ideological and political hangups and maneuvering and it would force both parties to work together for the good of the people we are supposed to be representing.

Mr. Speaker, instead, I think on a bill such as this they are getting more maneuvering, more political posturing, and more business as usual.

Today is Veterans Day. I had intended to be in my district today at three separate veterans celebrations and one additional one tomorrow. Obviously, I am not going to get there under these circumstances. My planes have already left.

□ 1015

We are supposed to be celebrating the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II. The veterans who fought in World War II did not have the luxury of playing political games. They did not have the luxury of cynical maneuvering. They simply had to plow ahead and do their job. I wish that we were following their example today. But unfortunately, we are not. In fact, we can go home and give all of the speeches we want to veterans telling them how much we care about them, but in fact the reality of this maneuver today is simply going to be that what we are going to be saying to every single veteran of World War II is: "Guess what, I have got a Veterans Day present for you, we are going to raise your Medicare part B premium on the order of between 11 and 13 bucks," depending upon whose numbers you listen to today.

So I guess it is kind of fitting that most Members of Congress will not be able to be home with their veterans today, because I think we ought to have a better message to give them than that.

Now, what this budget, what the budget does that is being pushed through the Congress is to cut education. It is going to cut health for kids. The idea behind it is that we are telling people to rely more on charities. But then what this vehicle proposes to do with the Istook amendment today is to say: Oh, by the way, we are

giving these charities much more to do because Government is bugging out on its concerns for children and its concerns for the poor, but by the way, we are going to shut things off so that these charities cannot lobby Congress and tell us what they think about those changes.

We know that the President will not sign this legislation. We know that the only result of what we are doing today is that the Government is going to shut down come Monday.

I would like to make one point and compare the way we proceeded last year with the way we are proceeding this year. Last year, when I chaired the Committee on Appropriations, every single appropriation bill was finished by the end of the fiscal year. That happened for one very simple reason, because when I took over as chairman, the very first thing I did was to go to the senior Republican on the committee and say: "Look, let us bridge our partisan differences and work out a bipartisan allocation of dollars among the 13 appropriation bills."

That is what we did. We worked it out in a bipartisan way, in a conciliatory way, and we passed all 13 of those bills for the first time since Harry Truman was President.

This time around my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in this session, has not been given the opportunity to do that. Instead, it is pretty apparent to me he has got his marching orders and the marching orders are very clear: "Load up these appropriation bills with as many partisan gimmicks as you can, create as much confrontation as you can, divide people as much as you can." And after those instructions have gone out, is it any wonder that Congress has not been able to finish its work?

This chart demonstrates that it has not been a Presidential failure of leadership which has resulted in this budget impasse. It has been a congressional failure of leadership. We have so far these three bills down to the White House. They have crossed the finish line. We have nine bills remaining that have a long way to go before they even get to the White House. The Labor-HHS bill passed by the House was in such an extreme form that the Republican-controlled Senate will not even take it up. Four other appropriation bills are tied up on the issue of abortion, a nonbudget item. Others are tied up because of extremist language that was attached on the environmental and several others are tied up because of money differences.

The fact is that 89 percent of the appropriations business that this Congress has to do is still not done. And that is not because of the failure of the President to provide leadership but because of the failure of this Congress to

bridge partisan differences and philosophical differences and do what is necessary to compromise in the interest of the people we represent.

That is why this rule is a fool's mission. This rule is going to produce a product which is going nowhere. We will all be back here Monday, after we have gone home and preached our psalms, we will come back Monday to pick up and clean up the damage done by the passage of this legislation today, because this will never become law. All it will do is increase the risk—and decrease the time necessary to avoid the risk—of blowing up this process with innocent people getting hit by the shrapnel.

That is all that is happening today. I speak with a great deal of regret because it seems to me that the job of Congress, instead of attaching the Istook amendment, which we know will simply bottle this legislation up, instead of insisting that we raise the Medicare part B premium, we ought to have a simple 1-month clean extension so we have some time to do our real work rather than the nonsense and posturing that is going on today represented by this joke of a bill and this joke of a rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would say, in light of the fact that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have no experience whatsoever in dealing with appropriations bills that will move us in the direction of a balanced budget, it seems to me that it is quite apparent that they are blocking our attempts to move toward a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Winter Park, FL [Mr. MICA], who has worked long and hard in his very short 4-year period of time to get us to this point of a balanced budget, unlike our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have served for years and years and years and controlled this place and have not done anything whatsoever to help us balance the Federal budget.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to contain myself when I hear the accusations from the other side. Again, we hear the Medicare threats that are made by the other side. It really galls me because they do not want to deal with the facts. If all else fails, I always say on the floor, read the bill. The bill in fact says that any savings in our proposal go into the Medicare trust fund. It is a simple fact. But they want to insist on scaring the seniors of this country.

And then they talk about veterans. What a shame, what a scam that here just before the eve of Veterans Day that in fact this side that has developed programs and plans that give better benefits, better benefits to illegal aliens and people who will not work in this country than they do to our veterans and our senior citizens.

This is a shame on the eve of that occasion.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, out of deference to those who want to get home to their districts to attend veterans' ceremonies, I reserve the balance of my time and hope that we can move ahead as expeditiously as possible, simply pass this rule, and Members can vote against the continuing resolution if they so choose when we begin debate on that.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

First of all, the gentleman from Florida protests too much; \$300 million in cuts in veterans benefits.

Last year we cut 400 programs. We have downsized, cut 400 of them, reduced their spending. This Congress has been about the business of reducing in the last Congress a trillion dollars in debt.

The fact of the matter is this is not serious business that we are about today. This is fiscally and personally irresponsible. There is not one on the other side of the aisle that does not know that this bill is dead, dead, dead. The President has said he is going to veto it.

I have served in this body since 1981. Almost every year that side of the aisle has strongly from all of the microphones in all of the committees urged this body, if it was going to pass a CR, a funding bill to keep Government going while the political disputes on this Hill continue, has strongly urged a clean CR. Democrats, do not lard it up. Do not force Reagan and Bush to sign something. Make it clean. In fact the Committee on Appropriations, for the large part, supported that effort and did that.

The fact of the matter is, until they took control, until their extremist agenda could not see the light of day in this House, they cannot pass bills. So what they want to do is put it in a continuing resolution and say, if you do not do it my way, then shut down the Government and put at risk the credit of the United States of America.

As I said, that is fiscally irresponsible. It is personally irresponsible. It is far, far less than the American public expects of this body and of each of us. Vote no on this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that, if this balanced budget CR is dead, dead, dead at the White House, it is for the reason that the White House opposes, opposes, opposes a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time so that Members can get home to their veterans.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman would reserve the balance of his time and stop yielding a few seconds every now and then to himself.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, certainly I am pleased that there is a new interest in honoring our veterans. If we really want to honor our veterans, do not force this country into default and lead to the cancellation and delay of services that our veterans need. If we really want to honor our veterans, do not raise their Medicare premiums. Do not cut the Medicare that over 8 million veterans in this country are eligible for. That is a way to honor our veterans.

How is it that we got ourselves as Americans into this mess where we stand on the brink of default for the first time in the history of the United States? Well, it happened for a number of reasons.

The first one was that our Republican colleagues wasted month after month trying to impose a contract on America that they told us was the greatest thing that had come along since sliced bread. Then in this morning's paper, we learn the truth, indeed the fiction behind that great contract on America.

Republican pollster Frank Luntz, a Gingrich protege, never really measured the contract's popularity in the first place. Luntz announced that he tested only ad campaign slogans supporting the contract. The House Republicans' legislative agenda is not losing popularity. It is probably just shutting popularity it never had in the first place.

The same story goes to quote the great pollster that backed up all this contract on America on which time was wasted instead of getting on with the real business of the American people as saying that the purpose of this polling had been to find the most persuasive wording of the contract's proposition for preselection ads in TV Guide.

You see, when you run Government by bumper sticker instead of Government by involving the people, by good sense, by attending to the real needs of the American people, you end up on the brink that we face today of default.

The second way they did it is through the appropriations process. Speaker after speaker has noted that they simply did not do their work. We were not supposed to be here in the middle of November dealing with appropriations bills. They were all due months ago. When we reached the deadline, 2 of 13 appropriations bills had been passed by the Republican majority and signed by the President of the United States. Why did they not get the work done? They had a little time after they wasted months with the contract on America. Well, we know why they were unable to complete their work, because the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations himself declared in committee, and I quote, it is payback time.

Yes, America, it is payback time, not to the ordinary people of America but those various extremist groups that dominate the Republican Party selection process. They deserve their due.

Well, we ended up, therefore, honoring our veterans instead of by appropriating the moneys for our national security, that bill has not been forwarded to the President's desk. It has been tied up. Finally, by contracting to the lobby the job of governing America, the Gingrichites have pursued error with excellence.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that I would be using 15 seconds or so each time to respond to the rhetoric that we have been listening to from the other side of the aisle. But I have come to the conclusion that we are going to have to bring out our big guns.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my friend, the gentleman from Glens Falls, NY [Mr. SOLOMON], distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

□ 1030

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would feel much better if the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] would use the Republican side so people in the audience do not get mistaken on who is saying what.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], one of the things I am most proud about in life is that many years ago Ronald Reagan and I saw the light. I was a John F. Kennedy, I was a Harry Truman, Democrat, and my party deserted my beliefs, and I became a Republican, and I am proud of it.

Now let me just say this: My colleagues, I do not know about the previous speaker and whether or not he is a veteran, but I am going to say something, my colleagues. I am a Marine Corps veteran, and I am proud of that, too, and I am going to tell my colleagues something.

I see the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] sitting back there, and there are two Members in this House that, I guess, have a reputation that we are so proud of because he and I, and I used to be the ranking Republican on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, but he and I stood up for these veterans, we developed a reputation, he probably even more than I, as being the two Members of Congress that really stood up; so I think when I stand up here today I am going to speak for the veterans of this Nation, I am going to speak for the older veterans of this Nation that some have referred to, older ones like me that are 65 years old and on Medicare, and I am going to tell my colleagues we are determined that we are going to save Medicare. It is not going to go bankrupt, and we are going to pursue it right to the end, and we

will succeed. We will save it for the people of this country and for my children and my grandchildren.

Now, as my colleagues know, I have been keeping track, and I am going to try to keep my emotions down, which I have a problem sometimes doing, but I have kept track of all the speakers on this side of the aisle, which is why I came over here to speak over here, and every one of them, just about, appear on this list. This is the National Taxpayers' Union list of big spenders.

Now what is ironic about that? As my colleagues know, we had the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] up here with his chart, and I do not have a chart, but let me just make one.

Here is a great big pie; OK? I wish everybody could see this. Talk in the mike? OK. It will not reach. I cannot get it over here.

Let me just show my colleagues what is on the pie. This pie is \$1½ trillion. I am getting help from my New York colleagues here. This pie represents the Federal budget, \$1½ trillion. And do my colleagues know of that budget there is a little set-aside there which requires \$250 billion just to pay the interest on the accrued national debt that now has reached \$5 trillion. Yes, we are paying \$250 billion to the holders of that \$5 trillion debt.

Who are the holders of that debt? Most of it is held by foreign countries, by the Netherlands, by Great Britain, and then we have holders in this country. I own some of these Treasury notes myself. But let me tell my colleagues what happens.

President Clinton gave us a budget last year, and I have got that chart over there someplace, but I will not bother to drag it out here now, but he wanted to increase that national debt, accumulated national debt, from \$5 trillion up to \$6 trillion.

Now then what happens to the amount of interest that we have to pay on that debt if we had let that go through? Instead of just \$250 billion, it would have grown to \$350 billion, and another \$100 billion would have been taken out of those available funds to pay for help for the truly needy, the people that really need the help.

Do my colleagues know what happens when we pursue this kind of irresponsible spending? Then interest rates go up, and inflation goes up.

Do my colleagues recall 1979 when Jimmy Carter was President? Interest rates rose to 23½ percent prime, which means businessmen like me at the time had to pay 26½ percent. Inflation went up from 4 percent all the way up to 13 percent. If that ever happened now with this kind of irresponsible spending, we would not have this kind of irresponsible spending, we would not have just a debt interest of \$250 billion or \$350 billion. It would go up to almost \$500 billion, and each time it raises from \$10, to \$20, to \$50 billion, that

means another \$10, or \$20, or \$50 billion that is there less, the funds that are there, for the truly needy.

So let me tell my colleagues something, Mr. Speaker. What is compassionate? What is compassionate for my children, and my grandchildren, and all of my colleagues', and all of those out there, is to bite the bullet and be fiscally responsible. That is exactly what we have been doing with these budgets. We are determined that we are going to bring this budget under balance.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to simply inquire of my friend who has served in this place for 17 years how many balanced budgets our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have fought for the way we are fighting for a balanced budget today, and I would be—

Mr. SOLOMON. I would say zero, and I would say this. When we took over, the gentleman and I took over the Committee on Rules this year, what was the first thing we did? We told the Republican Party, "You have no choice but to offer a balanced budget on this floor." We said to the Democratic Party, "You have no choice but to offer a balanced budget on the floor of this Congress." We wrote to the President of the United States, and never got an answer, and we said, "Mr. President, you have no choice but to offer a balanced budget on the floor of this Congress."

What did that do? That meant that anybody's alternative had to be balanced because that was the most serious problem facing this Nation, and that is what we got. We are going to pursue the balanced budget.

Now I have just been passed a little note—

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to my good friend from Texas.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. I thank the gentleman very much. I appreciate it now that we are talking about balanced budgets. I want to be sure that the gentleman is aware that during the 12 years of Reagan and Bush they sent budgets over here that in 11 of those 12 years had to be cut by this Congress, which seems to be a little different history than the gentleman is offering to the public here.

The other point I wanted to make or question I wanted to ask the gentleman was this:

The gentleman says that we have a great need to balance the budget which means we cannot spend too much, we have got to have that money to pay our debt. In that case why does the gentleman have a \$245 billion tax cut in his budget mostly for rich people?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I will tell the gentleman why we do. Because

a capital gains tax cut means so much to the farmers that I represent in upstate New York. Let me tell the gentleman—

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. The gentleman here in 1981—

Mr. SOLOMON. Do not interrupt, my friend. Mr. Speaker, I did not interrupt my colleague. Let me tell my colleague what a \$500 tax cut does to the people who are making \$21,000 or \$22,000 or \$30,000 or even \$40,000. They are trying to salvage enough money for a downpayment on a home and then be able to meet the mortgage payment on that home. Let me tell my colleague they are better off having the money in their pocket instead of the gentleman's pocket in the Congress to go and spend on it.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleague, "We ain't going to do it anymore. We're going to balance the budget."

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], if he was a Republican in the past as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] was a Democrat in the past.

I say to the gentleman, "We're happy to have you, CHARLIE."

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I came to this side of the aisle because it is going to be difficult to distinguish me from my dear friend and colleague. We are both 65. We are both combat veterans. We both come from the great State of New York. We both love our country. In addition, Mr. Speaker, we both seek a balanced budget. The only difference I think we have is how we achieve that. Our veterans association kind of thinks that my buddy from upstate New York is wrong in how he wants to achieve it.

Mr. Speaker, those that fought and were in the dugouts trying to preserve this great Nation somehow do not understand today this \$245 billion tax cut that we are talking about on Veterans Day. I cannot find any of the organizations, the American Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled Veterans—I really cannot find them reaching out for this capital gains tax cut that our veterans are talking about.

Now I am 65, I have more of a concern in Medicare than ever before. Right here in this resolution we are talking about increasing the premium, for my colleague and for me and for those veterans that are 65 and over. It says here, it says here, even though most Republicans would not know this because these things do not go through committee anymore, but my colleague should know it because it comes from the Speaker's office; it says here that according to CBO, part B premiums will increase under this CR from \$42.50 a month under current law to \$55.10.

The resolution changes current law. It sets the premiums at 31.5 percent of part B expenditures instead of the 25 percent in current law, and my colleagues say they are not changing anything. This is even higher than what did fly through without hearings by the Republicans in the Committee on Ways and Means which had jurisdiction before the Committee on Rules, and the Speaker's office thought it can be done in a different way.

To get back to the Medicare increases, there was a shrieking voice here about 10 minutes ago claiming, the gentleman from Florida, claiming that we were trying to frighten our senior citizens, meaning me and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] included, if we did not know what our colleagues were up to. We rely on those that provide the services. Being Catholic, I went to Catholic Charities, who provide for we old folks when we need help. They vigorously oppose what our colleagues are doing to Medicare. Then I went to my Jewish friends, and I went to the Jewish Council Against Poverty, who provide for old folks. They vigorously oppose this. The Protestant Council that provide for our poor and for our aged, if my colleagues find every hospital that provides nursing home for those that have been rejected by society, they oppose it.

So my friend from Florida, please go home to where the old folks are, go to the nursing homes, go to the hospitals, go to the clinics, and ask the old folks who is against them.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, maybe I should stand right in the middle, but in any case today we are talking about, and the gentleman from California, my good friend from New York, who I know it grieves him to be away from his veterans on Veterans Day, we are talking about a balanced budget. But guess what? We are not here because of a balanced budget. That is not what is holding it up. That is not why we are here. We are here for one reason. There is a sophomore Congressman from Oklahoma who has an idea that seems outlandish even to his Republican colleagues in the Senate, and he is keeping us here today on an amendment that has nothing to do with the balanced budget. The extremists on that side of the aisle have this goofy scheme, and their leadership cannot even whip them in line.

Make no mistake about it. We are just observers, we on this side of the aisle. It is Republican versus Republican. It is those on the far right versus those on the very far right.

□ 1145

You guys and you gals cannot agree. You cannot get your act together. That is why the gentleman from New York,

JERRY SOLOMON, cannot be home with his veterans today.

Mr. Speaker, I have a message to the Speaker and the majority leader and the chairman of the Committee on Rules and the other members of the Committee on Rules: Tell the gentleman from Oklahoma that his idea is kooky, tell him he knows that he cannot get it passed on the floor of the House alone, and he cannot get it passed on the floor of the Senate alone; he should stop all these tricks, show some leadership, get his act together, and then maybe we can debate the real issue, the balanced budget.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Winter Park, FL [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I only need 1 minute, really, to address the House, Mr. Speaker, to refute the comments from the other side.

It was not our side that said this Medicare system is going bankrupt. It was their Presidential Commission, made up of their Cabinet members. Our plan only limits the increase in spending. There are increases. But what they want to do is continue the bankrupt policy.

Read today's paper. See what Secretary Rubin has said. He said that to make this thing work, to go on spending us into debt, to continue this tax-and-spend policy, we will even rob the retirement funds, the trust funds, what little is left in them, to keep this scam going.

That is what this is about. That is what has to end. People are tired of the tax-and-spend and wasteful policy, and they want these programs in order, and our seniors demand that they be in order. The 10 percent and 13 percent increases in Medicare that have continued are crazy. What is wrong with doing away with fraud, waste, and abuse and adopting some of the other reforms we have proposed?

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, we did read the front page of the papers today. What we found out was that the Contract With America was based upon a phony and fraudulent poll. We did read the front pages of the paper today. What we found out is the American people do not believe you, they do not trust you, and they do not like what you are doing to them. That is what was on the front pages of the paper today.

The American people have caught on to what you are doing. They know you are not preserving and protecting Medicare. They know you are hurting the elderly in this country. They know you are hurting the children in this country. They know you are willing to put another million children into poverty. Why? So you can give a tax break to your wealthy contributors, the

wealthiest people in this Nation, because that is what your plan does.

You spent 100 days in an ideological feeding frenzy around here, accomplishing nothing except slapping one another on the back and slapping the taxpayers and the poor people in this country in the face. So for 100 days you have nothing to show for it.

October came and went. We do not have the appropriations bill done. We do not have a budget done because, as the previous speaker said, this is a fight among Republicans. This was a fight among some Republicans who think we ought to govern while we are here, and other Republicans that think we ought to burn the place down, and those who want to hand them the matches. That will not work. That will not work with the American people. Every poll, every measurement of the American people are telling you, "Don't do it." Do not do this to their parents, grandparents; do not do this to their parents, do not do this to their children. Give them an opportunity for an education, give them an opportunity for health care security, give them an opportunity to live the twilight of their life with dignity.

What is the gift you gave to veterans in my district, the veterans in the district of the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the district of the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO]? That was a promise. It was in the budget but it was taken out here. We did read the papers, and America is reading the papers. America is on to you. They are on to you. You cannot run, you cannot hide. Pass a clean budget. Pass a clean continuing resolution. Pass a clean debt limit.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Garden Grove, CA [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I heard a lot of references to senior citizens and to grandparents. I am a senior citizen, and I enjoy it immensely. I have a 10th grandchild on the way.

We have a blueprint before us on what we are supposed to be all about here. It is called the Preamble to the Constitution. I think at this moment, among all this frivolity and false charges about how we are trying to hurt me, and how we are trying to hurt me and my fellow grandparents, that we take a look at that beautiful blueprint to what this Constitution is all about, that we are supposed to honor in this place. We the people of the United States, in order to, and it should have a colon there, as we go into the list of things that we are supposed to do. We are supposed to be involved in an ongoing process here to form a more perfect union. Sometimes it gets a little rough, but that is what we are trying to do.

Then it says we want to establish justice. Look at court TV sometime. Look at the Menendez brothers' trial or the

latest fiasco in Los Angeles. The justice system is getting a little worn here, and that is why we need a lot of reform, like the habeas corpus that was in the bill we passed yesterday over a lot of hollering and objection from the liberals in this Chamber.

Then we are supposed to ensure domestic tranquility. Have you been in some of our neighborhoods in some of our big urban areas? Not much domestic tranquility out there.

Then, to provide for the common defense. If the psychopathic government in Iran lobbs one rogue missile in our direction, or at Jerusalem or Haifa, we do not have any ability to stop it, after all the trillion dollars we put into defense just over the last decade. That is a disgrace, and it is not on this side of the aisle.

Then it says, "Promote the general welfare." Go look up welfare in a 1700's dictionary, and it means the business climate, to help enhance the creation of jobs, not welfare as it is in this century.

Then, after promoting a general, healthy business climate, the creation of jobs, here comes the payoff: "To secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves," nothing wrong with enlightened self-interest, "and to our posterity." That is my 10th grandchild, due to arrive in January; for some of you recordholders, like the gentleman from California, HENRY GONZALEZ, the gentleman from California, RON PACKARD, or the gentleman from Kentucky, 30.

Here is Clinton's budget projection for 10 years. It is a nightmare. Let us work together here, folks. We can get the job done, for posterity.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of our time to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today for a very simple reason. There has been gross mismanagement of this session. For no other reason.

This is a continuing resolution, to continue appropriations. Why? Because the majority has not been able to pass their appropriation bills, 1½ months after the fiscal year ended. Why are they trying to muddy it up with Medicare? Medicare? Medicare is not an appropriation bill.

The reality is, before the session ends, we need to deal with Medicare, but we do not need to adopt their extreme agenda of \$270 billion of cuts in Medicare, either to stabilize Medicare or to balance the budget. We do not have to increase the premiums on millions of poor elderly in the fashion that they are trying to do today, for either purpose of stabilizing Medicare or balancing the budget.

But we should not be arguing that today, on a continuing appropriation bill. Why do they try and put it on? Just to make sure the President will veto it. They can pretend they have done something. They know it is not going to happen. It is phony. But why are they even dealing with Medicare? Because they have not been able to deal with the budget, 1½ months after the fiscal year ended.

You should have been doing that, what you are doing now, in July, but you were off chasing butterflies or something, not doing your work, not getting it organized, so now you come with this dumb bill, crazy provisions in it, trying to stick it to the seniors in this country. We should vote no.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, although I do not plan to use much of it.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are obviously unhappy with the 537 Federal elected officials, the 435 of us in this House, 100 Members in the U.S. Senate, and the two people elected in the executive branch. They are unhappy as they watch this bickering that is going on over this battle that we have.

Today is a Federal holiday. Tomorrow is actually Veterans Day, but we are marking it today. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and many of our colleagues hope very much to be able to participate in events. That is one of the reasons we have tried to limit this debate, which is simply on the rule, so we can allow Members to have a chance to vote for or against this continuing resolution.

But as we proceed with this, it seems to me that it is very important to recognize what it is that got us to this point. Between 1977 and 1987, there were 63 continuing resolutions. We hear this criticism of this process but we are, right now, struggling to move toward a balanced budget. While people are unhappy with the bickering that is going on today, I am convinced that they are much more unhappy with the prospect of perpetuating that business as usual. That business as usual has been a pattern which has led to doing nothing more than passing onto the shoulders of future generations the responsibility of continuing profligate spending.

So what is it that we are saying? We are saying that as we move ahead with this continuing resolution, we should put into place the kinds of things that the American people want, that will reduce the size and scope of government, recognize that we must save the Medicare system, rather than allowing it to go bankrupt, as the President's Commission on Medicare said in their April 3 study that came out.

So it seems to me we have a responsibility to do the right thing. Everyone is unhappy with the fact that we are bickering. I am unhappy with the fact

that we are here today. The fact of the matter is that we are doing the people's business. We want to do that right now by passing out this rule, so we can proceed with the debate on the continuing resolution. Then let us get the two people who were elected by all the American people at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue to sit down and come to an agreement, so that we can ensure that by the year 2002 we are able to pass on to the children of the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY], who will at that point be graduating from high school, a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this question are postponed until after debate on House Resolution 262.

□ 1100

REQUEST TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 118, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 118, a clean CR, and ask its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, and recorded on page 534 of the House Rules Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the gentleman's request until it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leadership.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of seeing to it that the Government does not come to a halt, when is the next point at which I might offer that motion to have a simple, clean, 1-month CR?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not be able to entertain such request until such time as it is cleared.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO DISPOSE OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 2586, TEMPORARY INCREASE IN THE STATUTORY DEBT LIMIT

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 262 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 262

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2586) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit, and for other purposes, with any Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House a motion offered by the majority leader or his designee to dispose of all Senate amendments. Any Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled between the majority leader and minority leader or their designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except any such demand made by the majority leader or his designee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 262 is a very simple, but very necessary, resolution providing for the further consideration of H.R. 2586, legislation which temporarily increases the statutory limit on the public debt.

Specifically, the resolution provides for the consideration in the House, without any intervening point of order, of a motion if offered by the majority leader or his designee to dispose of any Senate amendments to H.R. 2586, the debt ceiling extension bill.

The rule also provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled between the majority leader and the minority leader, or their designees.

The rule further provides that the previous question is ordered to final adoption without intervening motion or a demand for a division of the question unless such a demand is made by the majority leader or his designee.

Mr. Speaker, those of us on this side of the aisle cannot overstate the importance of passing this legislation and ensuring the continued confidence in our Government's ability to meet its most fundamental financial obligations.

No one likes the idea of extending or increasing the limit on public debt. It means simply that the Federal Government must be given new authority to

borrow additional money in order to meet its obligations.

For some on our side, that is a tough proposition to swallow, especially since we have seen the buying power of millions of American workers' paychecks decline in the past as Washington piled up higher and higher debt.

That is why it is so important to the future of this Nation and its economy that we get our fiscal house in order, and take the steps needed today to reverse the trend of spiralling Federal debt.

H.R. 2586, as it returns to the House from the other body, preserves much of what was included in the House-passed version, in addition to the debt limit increase. There is the provision authored by Chairman SOLOMON which commits Congress and the President to enacting legislation this year to achieve a balanced budget no later than the year 2002, before the debt limit is increased any further. This is the crux of the whole debate.

We owe it to our children and grandchildren to be as forthright as possible on such an important goal.

There is also coverage of certain anticancer oral drug treatments for both prostate and breast cancer. There is badly needed habeas corpus reform taken from the Senate-passed antiterrorism bill which changes the seemingly endless appeals system that prevents swift and certain justice.

And, finally, there is long-overdue language aimed at bringing common-sense relief to entrepreneurs, businesses, and consumers all across America who are unfairly saddled with costly, often duplicative Federal regulations.

One key item which was removed by the Senate last night is legislation to abolish the Department of Commerce. This would be a major step toward downsizing and streamlining the Federal Government, and I am hopeful that the House can revisit this critical issue again soon.

The bill soon to be before us is not just about temporarily increasing the debt limit. And it is not about political brinkmanship, as so many of our critics have written. What it is about is making a serious, meaningful down-payment on our commitment to balancing the budget in 7 years.

With this legislation, and the changes made to it by the other body, we have the opportunity to cut spending, to shrink the size and reach of the Federal bureaucracy, and to give the American people new hope in our ability to do more with less.

This is an opportunity we simply cannot afford to miss, Mr. Speaker, and we invite the President and our friends in the minority to join us in this historic effort. Unfortunately, as today's Washington Post describes, the President seems focused instead on preparing for a Governmentwide shutdown.

I believe the dedicated Federal workers, who keep the Government running day-in and day-out, deserve much better than that. Instead of preparing for a shutdown, we are doing our best to put this country on a sound financial footing—something that will benefit all Federal workers, whether they live and work in the Washington area, or Columbus, OH, or anywhere else.

Mr. Speaker, we do not want to see the lives of Federal workers and their families disrupted by a completely unnecessary shut down of the Federal Government.

Under the terms of this simple and fair rule, which was adopted unanimously by the Rules Committee last evening, there will be ample time to debate the merits of any motion if offered by the majority leader to dispose of Senate amendments to H.R. 2586.

As our colleagues know, time is getting short, and we must act responsibly and expeditiously to pass both the continuing resolution and the debt ceiling extension.

Anything less would clearly show that we have abandoned our promise to the hard-working taxpayers of this country to govern sensibly and with a firm commitment to fiscal responsibility.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this rule and to get on with the business the people sent us here to conduct.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Resolution 262 is a rule which will allow consideration of H.R. 2586 and Senate amendments to increase temporarily the Federal debt ceiling. As my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE], described, this rule provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

The level of the debt ceiling is the amount of money that the Federal Government can borrow to pay its debts. As Federal borrowing increases, the debt ceiling must be raised. Failure to raise the debt ceiling would prevent the Federal Government from paying its bills.

Today is Veterans Day. Traditionally, it is a day that House Members return to their districts to honor America's veterans. Instead, we are here in the House Chamber taking up a bill that is necessary to ensure the financial soundness of the U.S. Treasury.

The immediate problem we face is the need to raise the debt ceiling. This requires a simple solution. Instead, we have a huge bill full of complex and controversial sweeteners added at the last minute to win enough votes for passage.

If we had done the right thing and passed a clean bill—without extra

sweeteners, the bill would probably be signed into law by now—and we could be home with our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, the bill we are taking up is basically the same bill we took up yesterday, except the Commerce Department provision was dropped. This is the wrong way to do it, and this is a bad bill.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], former chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, for the second time today, this House is considering a bill that should be high above politics.

And, once again today, the Republican House will pass a bill that the President will be forced to veto.

Mr. Speaker, this is no way to run the Congress.

If the majority doesn't do its job responsibly, if the majority doesn't put politics aside, a lot of Americans are going to suffer.

People with pension plans will be hurt, people with adjustable rate mortgages will be hurt, people with payroll deduction plans will be hurt, people who served in the military will not get their benefits.

This will add insult to injury. Today is Veterans Day, the day we are supposed to honor our country's soldiers, not use them as pawns in a political game.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of whether the United States defaults on its loans should be high above politics.

Let's act responsibly, defeat this rule and let's pass a clean debt-limit extension.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, it is sad that we must be here today. This is business that should have been completed in June or July of this year.

The reason why it has not been completed is because of totally inept leadership on the part of the Speaker of this body.

As all of us know, a year ago there was an election. We Democrats lost the election. We went into minority status around here and the Republicans took control. They have sufficient votes to run this House and to do anything they want to. We are in this position today because the Republicans simply cannot get their own act together to do the right thing, to pass the appropriations bills.

Mr. Speaker, they have not been passed. There are still nine of them

floating around out in space somewhere and they are being held up by the Republicans, not by the Democrats.

This debt-ceiling legislation should have been handled in July. Every Republican in this House has voted at least three times to raise the debt limit before to a total of \$5.5 trillion. They have already voted on that three times. Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means have voted on it four times; never raised a question about raising the debt ceiling.

But here at the last minute, because they have got some bells and whistles they want to attach that they cannot get past their own Members, they are trying to stick them on nongermane legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we Democrats are not holding up this House. We are not forcing this crisis. The President is not forcing this crisis. The appropriations bills simply have not gotten to him. He has not had a chance to exercise his authority that is required by the Constitution over these bills.

Congress has not had a chance to vote on a debt ceiling that the Republicans will turn loose. They keep changing the dates, changing the amounts, and all of those things.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the American public, "Do not blame us, American folks. Blame the Republicans. You put them in charge, and they are simply not doing their duty."

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], my good friend who is just walking off the floor, the gentleman is a Member that I have great admiration and respect for, but I really was taken aback by the gentleman's statement a few minutes ago when we almost had to rise and have his words taken down.

□ 1115

I would not do that because of the respect that I have for him. But one cannot stand up here and talk about the inept leadership of the Speaker. That goes against the rules of the House.

Having said that, I just have great admiration and respect for another Member of this House, and that is NEWT GINGRICH. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] has shown unbelievable leadership in getting us to this point that we are in now. It is such a serious problem that we have this sea of red ink that is literally ruining this country. It has turned us into a debtor nation. We cannot continue down this path.

That is why we are doing everything that we can to leverage legislation that we have been gagged from doing over the last 40 years. Things like product liability reform, so badly needed to

create jobs in this country so that business and industry could be successful, regulatory reform. I come from the State of New York where we are the highest taxed State in the Nation. We are the most overregulated State in the Nation. Our businesses cannot survive there. They are leaving with thousands of manufacturing jobs, not only leaving the State but leaving the country.

What do we have in this bill? We have regulatory reform. Beyond that, we have my amendment, which simply states, I am going to read it to Members. I would like my colleagues to tell me what is wrong with this. It says, with the enactment of this act, the President of the United States and this Congress—my colleagues, that is you and I—commit themselves to enacting legislation in calendar year 1995 to achieve a balanced budget not later than the fiscal year 2002. That is 7 years down the road.

It goes on to say, it is further the sense of Congress that the Congress will not pass an increase in the permanent statutory limit on the public debt until such time that the President has signed into law the balanced budget legislation referred to in this section.

Now, we finally have gotten President Clinton to come around from saying we could not balance the budget, to say that we could do it in 10 years. Then we finally got him to say, well, maybe we could do it in 8 or 9; and now he is saying maybe we could do it in 7 years. That is all we are saying in this piece of legislation.

You know, another thing in here, it surprised me, my good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], because what we do is we say that the President or the administration or anybody else cannot dip into Social Security trust funds or Federal Government retirement funds. I do not know about you, but when I hold town meetings, that is the thing they complain about the most: You people are fiscally irresponsible. Leave our money alone. That is what we do in this continuing resolution.

Then we have a fourth item which has to do with breast cancer and prostate cancer. Everybody in this room supports that legislation, so what is wrong with tacking it on here?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman did ask a question; will anybody come down and respond? The reason that I am here is, the gentleman said the point of what he is proposing right now is that we not touch the Social Security trust fund.

Why would the gentleman put that in at this stage when the budget that has been proposed for balancing in the year 2002 by the majority does precisely that to the tune of \$636 billion.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is absolutely incorrect. In other words, we have a continuing resolution. It is a clean resolution that the President could sign and keep the Government functioning except for these items I have just read off. One of them was, we cannot dip into the Social Security trust fund because it is not our money to dip into. It is my money. It is the gentleman's money. I do not want him dipping into my funds.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I understand. I am all for it. But how is it possible then for him to make that proposal at this juncture when the budget that has been put forward by the majority does precisely that? It dips into the Social Security trust fund, to the ostensible surplus, to the tune of—I will tell the gentleman what the numbers are. They start in 1996 with \$63 billion. It is in the gentleman's budget document, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me tell the gentleman this. In the reconciliation bill that has come before this body, it balances the budget. It does not touch trust funds at all, and we are not going to.

What I am asking the gentleman is, let us pass this clean CR, clean continuing resolution that has these couple of items in there which none of us object to. So what is the objection? Let us pass it. Let us go home. Let us make our veterans speeches and meet with our veterans and come back here Monday.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding time to me and conclude by saying that I think the reason that I think we find great difficulty in carrying out what the gentleman requests of us is that it runs exactly contradictory to what the reconciliation budget will present to us.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the legislation that is before us right now is legislation that we can continue the Government functioning over the next 10 days or until December 13. That is what we need. We know that the debt limit is not going to run out in between now and the time that this would be signed into law. Let us go ahead and do it. Let us drop the rhetoric, and let us get the job done.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, we have heard many comments that this is Veterans Day. As a veteran, I cherish the opportunity to recognize the enormous contributions that the men and women in uniform have made to this country. We honor them and the free Nation they fought for, the freedoms they defended, including the core freedom of speech and association.

Now, what does one of the bills pending before the House right now do? It

includes an absolutely crazy provision that will regulate the speech of veterans organizations.

Suddenly, it dawns on me why things have been dragged out, in fact, to make sure that Members cannot get home on Veterans Day. Maybe it was deliberate, the mismanagement of the process that has kept us here as long as it has.

To my colleagues, I hope you will be able to go home and let your veterans organizations know what we have really done to them. I hope that you will be proud to let them know that we are restricting the ability of the Vietnam Veterans of America to speak out about substance abuse and treatment, that we are trying to gag the Disabled American Veterans as they push the Veterans Administration to deal with disability issues. Is that how we want to honor veterans on their day?

What a disservice, what a dishonor, not just to our veterans but to the Constitution they fought for.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, just so we are clear about this, the provision to which the gentleman just spoke is not a part of debt ceiling increase. That was on the CR which was the last rule we just voted upon, just so everybody knows to keep those two straight.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I have heard several of our Republican colleagues saying that we should keep our speeches short today so we can get home and give our speeches tomorrow to our veterans.

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care, I have a better idea. Let us cancel our speeches and stay here in Washington as we should to keep Government from being shut down. We are on the brink of shutting down VA regional offices all over America that provide critical services to the men and women who served our country in uniform. We do them no honor by speaking to them tomorrow, by going on vacation in our districts this weekend while Government is on the brink of shutting down veterans health care services, many crucial services in our VA hospitals, and shutting down our VA regional offices.

That is irresponsible. What the Republican leadership is doing by letting us go on vacation this weekend is basically saying that to the veterans who are out there at sea at risk of drowning, the homeless, the sick, the ill, we are saying, we are going to take a vacation this weekend. We are going to go back home to our districts and speak to veterans. And by the way, do not drown over the weekend. We are going to come back on Monday and we might throw you a liferaft. We might think about your interests at that time.

That is irresponsible. I would like some Member of the Republican leadership to say why we are honoring veterans by risking the shutdown of their services by leaving this weekend. We know this bill is going to be vetoed. If we truly care about veterans, let us stay here and keep working on a bipartisan basis to keep that health care service that our veterans have fought for and the service that they deserve open.

It is wrong. It is irresponsible. It is hypocritical to our American veterans to say that we are going to go home and give our speeches this weekend when we are risking the life preserver they desperately need.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I do not know about the gentleman, but when I go home I do not consider it being on vacation. I work in my district. I talk to my constituents. I visit with my veterans. That is not vacationing. That is an important part of this job. Every Member should consider it so.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, even at this moment when we stand on the brink of fiscal disaster, on the brink of closing down services upon which millions of Americans depend, our Republican friends cannot get themselves out of the clutches of special interest lobbies. On this issue of debt limit, they came to the floor yesterday afternoon and added something totally irrelevant, over 200 pages endorsed by a series of special interest lobbies, written in the dead of night, never presented for a hearing, never heard or discussed on this floor with what they call regulatory reform.

What it means to those veterans that are watching is that we are going to engage in unilateral disarmament. Yes, the power to protect the people of the United States from unsafe products, to protect them from foul water and foul air, we are going to disarm unless the lobby approves. In fact, no new regulations can go into effect unless some peer review committee that includes lobbyists says it is OK. You let the tobacco companies decide how to regulate tobacco. That is the theory of this that we are debating right now. That is included here along with the debt limit though it has absolutely nothing to do with it.

The last measure we considered included lobby control. What kind of lobby does it control? The Texas Council on Family Violence will be running a hotline to help battered women all over this country. Because they take Federal dollars to administer that hotline, they cannot come to Washington and speak out about the wrongs in this Republican budget. Do they control the polluters and the loophole lawyers? No.

They want to muzzle the National Council on Senior Citizens because it had the courage to speak out against the cuts on Medicare that are in this budget. And the latest chapter, it is in today's Wall Street Journal with the title "Gingrich Backer Had Unusual Access" as a volunteer in the Speaker's office, that the Speaker contracted out his own office to a special interest lobbyist.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN].

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I would say to all of my colleagues that in the last Congress I introduced major regulatory reform legislation; we call it the Sunset Reform Act. It was reintroduced in this Congress. This major regulatory reform relief provision has now passed through the subcommittee with a very strong bipartisan support. It is out of the full committee, and it is pending on the calendar of this House of Representatives.

In the contract on America, there is also regulatory reform and there was habeas corpus reform. What we find and what I want to tell my colleagues is this Member of Congress who has been a leader on these issues knew nothing about this late-night stealth attack on the potential strength of the Treasury of the United States when the Republican Party puts into a debt ceiling extension major regulatory reform that has not been conferred by the House and Senate, that does the damage the previous gentleman spoke to, that was a part of the contract on America that had not passed the House and the Senate. And they did the same with habeas corpus reform, one of their contract provisions which has gone nowhere. They are using the potential fiscal health of the entire Nation as their medium to accomplish these goals.

□ 1130

This is wrong, and Americans know it. We should not pass this rule, we should not pass this legislation, and of course the President will veto this bill, as he should. We ought not to be a part of this. We ought to be doing what is right. We ought to be working on Veterans Day to make sure that our veterans, and our seniors, and our children, and the weakest among us have an opportunity to participate in this great society.

This Republican budget is a disaster, this rule is a disaster, this entire process is wrong, and we should reject it.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker and Members, I never thought I would see the

day that Republicans would endanger the well-being of veterans. We have come to a point in time where veterans stand to be denied the ability to have their claims processed because of what we are going through here today.

Mr. Speaker, I serve on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and I watched many Members from the other side of the aisle wave the flag, and talk about being in the parades, and how much they love veterans. Well, we need to be here today telling the real story; on this side of the aisle I think we are doing that.

Mr. Speaker, what we are saying today is, "Republicans, who are willing to threaten the well-being of veterans with this brinkmanship, we need to stop this foolishness. We need not go home. We need not go home, and march in those parades, and tell the veterans how much we love them when, in fact, we are hurting them in this process." But the Republicans budget would keep them at spending levels for 1995, Mr. Speaker, which means that over 125,000 veterans would be denied health care services.

This charade needs to stop. Let us remain here until we can get it right. Let us take the machoism out of this fight. Let us do what is necessary to fund the services and programs of this Nation. Let us not use veterans and the people of this country as tools in this bickering. It is time for us to do the right thing.

Veterans, get on the telephone. Call into this House. Let the Republicans know that they need to stop this. If they want to honor our veterans on Veterans Day, tell them to stop the brinkmanship. Do not put something on the President's desk that they know he is going to veto and cause our veterans to be at risk.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, allow me to explain what this is all about.

The debt ceiling limit of the United States is the authority of this Federal Government to borrow money. Because the United States has a national debt, our Treasury must issue bonds and other securities to secure that debt on a regular basis. Congress must give them authority to do so.

None of us like the fact that our Nation is in debt, but we are not about to lose our credit rating as a nation. So we reluctantly and sometimes painfully vote for an extension of this so-called debt ceiling limit so that the full faith and credit of the United States of America is not encumbered.

This vote today on the debt ceiling limit, which is the subject of this rule, is going to create a fiscal crisis in this country because the Republicans have

insisted that we will not just vote on this issue. They want to throw in a lot of extraneous issues. They want to throw in regulatory reform.

Mr. Speaker, that sounds so simple. It turns out to be a 200-page amendment drawn up by special interest groups, by polluters, corporate polluters, who want to make sure that they have their say in the process of establishing environmental regulations, establishing the standards by which we regulate the water, the streams, the air of this country. What in the world does this have to do with the debt ceiling? Nothing. It is a political gimmick. It is trying to put pressure on the President to sign a bill he does not accept.

Mr. Speaker, the President will veto this bill, and it is a sad commentary that we have reached this point. Some Republicans have gone so far as to say, "Don't worry about the debt ceiling limit. We are just going to postpone paying American taxpayers their income tax refunds next year; we think they'll understand." Wait a minute. Have my colleagues spoken to those families and those taxpayers? They are counting on those checks.

They have also suggested, "Don't put the payroll taxes in the Social Security trust fund for a while. That will carry us on." That shows us the limits they are prepared to go to force this shutdown strategy of the Federal Government.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, we continue to reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguish gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] for yielding this time to me, and I want to acknowledge my distinguished friend from New York who previously spoke to this issue and mentioned the great service that he gave to this country, and I certainly acknowledge it. Being my age and being a female, I did not have the honor, but I can say that I have come from a military family that appreciated the desire and the need to serve their country and was honored for doing so.

I can come to my colleagues this morning, however, and speak to them as a parent raising a 10-year-old and a 15-year-old, and I can assure my colleagues that, when I hear from my constituents in Houston, they simply ask to pass a straightforward continuing resolution, streamlined to deal with the issues at hand, because those of us who are parents and working every day, we know the bottom line: To get the job done. Mr. Speaker, this resolution proposed by the Republicans, my friends, does not get the job done.

Mr. Speaker, what it says to the Catholic charities that many of us benefit from throughout this Nation is

that they cannot come to express their views about services to the elderly because they are lobbyists and they take Federal money. It denies them the right to free speech. That is what is in this continuing resolution, which is simply to keep the doors open.

In addition, then it says to Federal employees, like those who—some gave their life in Oklahoma City, "We don't care about you and the fact that the Social Security Administration may have to deny new recipients their eligibility checks, individuals who have come upon hard times, disabled senior citizens and otherwise." They will not be able to be taken care of in the manner that they have taken care of this Nation by paying their taxes.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this continuing resolution debate is all about, and then we ask about the Commerce Department. Someone seems to want to raise that up as the whipping boy, but do my colleagues know that the Constitution included the fact that this Government is responsible for commerce? Do my colleagues know that commerce creates jobs and that countries like Germany and Japan are in fact uplifting and enhancing their opportunities to compete? We need jobs in this Nation. Get a downsized Commerce Department; I do not want a big bloated Department, but it can be done. This eliminates the opportunity to create jobs: \$3 billion in contracts in the last 6 months created by the Commerce Department.

Then we now come to our veterans, and I have a special place in my heart for them, but come Monday at midnight we will have veterans without health services, we will have veterans who we pretend to honor without health services, and what it means is we will have veterans who will be listening to a lot of lip service. They do not want lip service, my colleagues. They want health care service; that is what we want in this country.

And then the budget debate. I believe in bringing down the deficit. I voted for a balanced budget amendment. I have done it in my own former life as a city council member, but I can tell my colleagues one thing. We are being misrepresented, too, because this deficit and this balance that we have completes well worldwide with other countries who have a far greater debt. We can do it with reason and not cut education, and we cannot cut health care and Medicare premiums that increase. We can do this by streamlining the continuing resolution. Let us vote down this rule.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker and Members, the suggestion is being made by the Republicans that,

if we do not pass the continuing resolution to fund the Government and we do not pass the debt limit to increase the debt of this Government so that we can make good the credit of the United States and the payment on that debt, that if we do not do it their way, it cannot be done. Mr. Speaker, it is simply not true. For a clean debt limit, for a clean CR, I am sure on this side of the aisle we can find 150-175 votes, and I am sure that if the Republicans scour their entire caucus, they could find 25, 30, 40 votes that are willing to see that this Government continue, that we continue to govern, and then we can continue on with the debate over Medicare, and the future of children in this country, and the future of education, but what we do not have to put at risk, what we do not have to put at risk, is the vital services of this Government, whether it is to veterans, or whether it is to the elderly, or whether it is to the schools of this Nation, or the transportation of this Nation. And even more importantly than all that, perhaps, is the credit of this Nation, that if we guess wrong and the markets react adversely, it will cost the homeowners and people who have debt in this Nation, who have mortgages. We ought not to put that at risk.

Mr. Speaker, we can pass a clean debt limit, we can pass a clean CR, in a matter of minutes, in a matter of minutes. But the Republicans have chosen to have an ideological fight. They have the fight going on now. That is why we do not see them on the floor of the House, because they are having that fight in their conference. But they also chose to have that fight with the people of the United States and the President of the United States, and to force that fight they want to shut down the Government. It is really unacceptable. It is really the sort of politics that should not exist any longer because with the world financial markets, and our world creditworthiness, and our ability to loan money and to recapture money around the world, we should not be playing with the credit rating of the United States of America.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, it may have struck a number of those observing this proceeding that there is not much response coming from the other side of the aisle. They are passing time and time again to allow Democrats to dominate the debate. That is because the Republican Members have been off the floor, meeting together, wrangling over the Istook amendment which has been so clearly described here this morning.

But what is really at stake is whether or not we are going to keep faith with the American people, with Fed-

eral employees, with all the services that people depend on and that this Government renders them.

We clearly have an inept Republican leadership. There is no way around it. It is rather hard, but I have to say it here. It is the 10th of November. The fiscal year began October 1. Two of 13 appropriation bills have been passed, no budget reconciliation. The entitlement program has been passed. Had we passed those appropriation bills, had we passed that budget reconciliation package, we would not be here in this crisis atmosphere. The debt limit would have been automatically extended. The Government would be in position to serve all the people who pay the taxes to support it. But the fact is that that ineptness has made it impossible for us to operate any other way but on a crisis basis.

Now Democrats have made it clear we are prepared to do whatever it takes to keep the American people from suffering as a result of our disagreements, and to allow Government to continue to function and our currency to continue to not be in default.

□ 1145

We have offered and will offer again today resolutions, clean resolutions, that allow the American people to continue to observe this debate but not have to make sacrifices that they ought not to have to make because they did not bring about this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, why are we still here? Because the Republican Members simply cannot even agree among themselves as to what we ought to be doing here on a day we ought to be home honoring our veterans. We have some Members who think we must pass pure Istook, the amendment which really deprives so many nonprofit entities across this country of their voice here in Washington. Others would like to accommodate the Senate, which attempted to water it down and make it more palatable, even though, in my view, fatally flawed, by now covering State and local government wants to address issues here in Washington.

That has made it impossible for Republicans even to tell us this morning whether they have the votes to pass this resolution on to the President, where he threatens to veto it, or were they unable to do that, to go to conference, which would mean they would not even be able to give the President the opportunity to exercise his responsible position before the clock runs and the Government shuts down.

That is what we are dealing with, division in the ranks that makes it impossible for Democrats, even in their most cooperative moments, to be helpful. But we will continue to try, and perhaps before this day is over, Republicans will come to their senses and accommodate what is reality.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to have a little colloquy with the gentleman from California.

I would ask the gentleman, is there anything in the continuing resolution and the extension of the debt limit that could not be handled regularly in legislation, either by suspension of the rules or in a regular bill? Is there anything in either one of these bills that could not be handled in the regular process in this bill?

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFNER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Absolutely not. No. There is no reason for us to impede the American people, to keep this crisis atmosphere in Washington. We can deal with that in the due course of events.

Mr. HEFNER. So, with the Republicans controlling both bodies, they could bring it up at their discretion?

Mr. FAZIO of California. That is absolutely right.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, what we have here today is a failure of leadership. That is why the thousands of Federal employees across the country, and certainly in my State, are going to face impending furloughs on Tuesday. That is why every homeowner with an adjustable rate mortgage faces interest rate increases if the debt ceiling is not extended and default occurs. Failure of leadership.

This House is under Republican leadership now. Republican leadership used to complain about when appropriation bills were not done in a timely fashion. It takes 13 bills to run this Government. They failed to pass 11 of them and enact them into law. They failed to bring these matters to the floor for timely debate.

The result is that what we have are two measures, debt ceiling extension and a continuing resolution that keeps the Federal Government going on a temporary basis. Both of them should be noncontroversial, both of them should be clean by themselves. Instead, what they have done is to tie such strings to each one of them as to make it impossible for the President to sign. That is why our Government is likely to shut down on Tuesday. That is why the economy of the United States is likely to face some roils and turmoil shortly thereafter. The first thing they are going to do is shut the Government down on Tuesday. The next thing they are going to do is help shut the economy down shortly thereafter.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WISE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I just noticed, with the cold weather approaching, and that is why I said we need to talk to the working Americans, that the Low-Income Energy Assistance Program is going to be drastically impacted. Senior citizens, working single parents with children in these cold climates will not get the assistance they can get if this crisis comes to be.

Mr. WISE. The gentlewoman is quite correct. In Texas, as in West Virginia, we just had our first snowfall, and the low-income energy assistance is drastically cut back, and of course, as she has pointed out many times on the floor, one of their measures they want to tack on is to increase the Medicare part B premium from \$42 to \$55.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have enough faith in my President that he will not allow this to happen, and I urge my friends on the other side to encourage the President not to let this happen.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, the last time that we had a similar debt ceiling crisis was during the Reagan administration. It was because of the very deep tax cuts that were enacted earlier in the decade. The folly of some of those tax cuts has been outlined in the book written by President Reagan's budget director, David Stockman, called "The Triumph of Politics," so I will not go into that, but we have a somewhat similar situation now.

At that time, what we did was to come up with a number of mechanisms to avoid a crisis occurring again. The problem with that debt ceiling bill is that it takes away the President's ability to avert such a crisis. It deliberately repeals those provisions, and thus ties his hands. That is the biggest objection to the debt ceiling bill, as far as I am concerned.

What will happen as a result is that Federal retirees will lose from their trust fund, about \$3.5 million a day. We have a letter from the experts that are in charge of the board that oversees those trust funds. It is a nonpartisan board. Their opinion was requested by the Republican chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. They wrote back and said Federal retirees will lose \$3.35 million a day if this debt ceiling bill is passed.

Another thing it does is to prevent the President from being able to reimburse those trust funds, so when we look into this bill, it is an irresponsible bill. The American public deserves better.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. HAYWORTH]. The Chair would inform the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] that he has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that this should be a very simple bill. Normally in the past when we pass a simple debt extension, it is two pages, maximum. They start off at 6 pages, that is not too bad, but at 10:30 about 1½ nights ago or 2 nights ago, with all these amendments, including regulatory reform, habeas corpus, it went up to well over 300 pages. Nobody had read the amendments, nobody understood the bill. I am almost positive there has not been anybody read this bill since it was increased to 350 pages in the past 2 days.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge defeat of the rule, and defeat, certainly, of the Senate amendment.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, through the years we have borrowed and borrowed and borrowed. When the Secretary of Treasury calls and says, "We need more money," we pass a two-page debt ceiling extension and we give him more money. The crux of the issue is that unless Washington agrees to balance the budget, we will no longer say yes when the Secretary calls. We will say balance the budget before we give more money. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the vote by the yeas and nays on House Resolution 261, which will be taken immediately after this vote on House Resolution 262.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 185, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 783]

YEAS—220

Allard	Baker (LA)	Barton
Archer	Ballenger	Bass
Armey	Barr	Bateman
Bachus	Barrett (NE)	Bereuter
Baker (CA)	Bartlett	Bilbray

Billirakis	Graham	Norwood
Bliley	Greenwood	Nussle
Blute	Gunderson	Oxley
Boehlert	Gutknecht	Packard
Boehner	Hall (TX)	Parker
Bonilla	Hancock	Paxon
Bono	Hansen	Petri
Brownback	Hastert	Pombo
Bryant (TN)	Hastings (WA)	Porter
Bunn	Hayes	Portman
Bunning	Hayworth	Pryce
Burr	Hefley	Quinn
Burton	Heineman	Radanovich
Callahan	Herger	Ramstad
Calvert	Hilleary	Regula
Camp	Hobson	Riggs
Canady	Hoekstra	Roberts
Castle	Hoke	Rogers
Chabot	Horn	Rohrabacher
Chambliss	Hostettler	Ros-Lehtinen
Chenoweth	Houghton	Roth
Christensen	Hunter	Royce
Chrysler	Hutchinson	Salmon
Clinger	Hyde	Sanford
Coble	Inglis	Saxton
Coburn	Istook	Scarborough
Collins (GA)	Johnson (CT)	Schaefer
Combest	Johnson, Sam	Schiff
Cooley	Jones	Seastrand
Crane	Kasich	Sensenbrenner
Crapo	Kelly	Shadegg
Cremins	Kim	Shaw
Cubin	King	Skeen
Cunningham	Kingston	Smith (MI)
Deal	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)
DeLay	Kolbe	Smith (TX)
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Smith (WA)
Doolittle	Largent	Solomon
Dornan	Latham	Souder
Dreier	LaTourrette	Spence
Duncan	Laughlin	Stearns
Dunn	Lazio	Stockman
Ehlers	Leach	Stump
Ehrlich	Lewis (KY)	Talent
Emerson	Lightfoot	Tate
English	Linder	Tauzin
Ensign	Livingston	Taylor (NC)
Everett	LoBiondo	Thornberry
Ewing	Longley	Tiahrt
Fawell	Lucas	Torkildsen
Fields (TX)	Manzullo	Upton
Flanagan	Martini	Vucanovich
Foley	McCollum	Waldholtz
Fowler	McCrery	Walker
Fox	McDade	Walsh
Franks (CT)	McInnis	Wamp
Franks (NJ)	McKeon	Watts (OK)
Frelinghuysen	Metcalfe	Weldon (FL)
Frisa	Meyers	Weller
Funderburk	Mica	White
Gallegly	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Ganske	Molinar	Wicker
Gekas	Moorhead	Wolf
Gilchrest	Morella	Young (AK)
Gillmor	Myers	Young (FL)
Gilman	Myrick	Zeliff
Goodlatte	Nethercutt	Zimmer
Goodling	Neumann	
Goss	Ney	

NAYS—185

Abercrombie	Clement	Engel
Ackerman	Clyburn	Eshoo
Andrews	Coleman	Evans
Baesler	Collins (IL)	Farr
Baldacci	Collins (MI)	Fattah
Barcia	Condit	Fazio
Barrett (WI)	Conyers	Filner
Becerra	Costello	Flake
Beilenson	Coyne	Foglietta
Bentsen	Cramer	Forbes
Bevill	Danner	Ford
Bishop	Davis	Frank (MA)
Bonior	de la Garza	Frost
Borski	DeFazio	Furse
Brewster	DeLauro	Gejdenson
Browder	Dellums	Gephardt
Brown (CA)	Deutch	Geren
Brown (FL)	Dicks	Gibbons
Brown (OH)	Dixon	Gonzalez
Bryant (TX)	Doggett	Gordon
Cardin	Dooley	Green
Chapman	Doyle	Gutierrez
Clay	Durbin	Hall (OH)
Clayton	Edwards	Hamilton

Harman	Meek	Sawyer
Hastings (FL)	Menendez	Schroeder
Hefner	Mfume	Schumer
Hilliard	Miller (CA)	Scott
Hinchey	Minge	Serrano
Holden	Mink	Shays
Hoyer	Moakley	Sisisky
Jackson-Lee	Mollohan	Skaggs
Jacobs	Montgomery	Skelton
Jefferson	Moran	Slaughter
Johnson (SD)	Murtha	Spratt
Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Stark
Kanjorski	Neal	Stenholm
Kennedy (MA)	Oberstar	Stokes
Kennedy (RI)	Obey	Stupak
Kennelly	Olver	Tanner
Kildee	Ortiz	Taylor (MS)
Klecza	Orton	Tejeda
Klink	Pallone	Thompson
Lantos	Pastor	Thurman
Levin	Payne (NJ)	Torres
Lewis (GA)	Payne (VA)	Towns
Lincoln	Pelosi	Trafigant
Lipinski	Peterson (MN)	Velazquez
Lofgren	Pomeroy	Vento
Lowe	Poshard	Visclosky
Luther	Rahall	Volkmer
Maloney	Rangel	Ward
Manion	Reed	Waters
Markey	Richardson	Watt (NC)
Mascara	Rivers	Williams
Matsui	Roemer	Wilson
McCarthy	Rose	Wise
McDermott	Roukema	Woolsey
McHale	Roybal-Allard	Wyden
McKinney	Rush	Wynn
McNulty	Sabo	Yates
Meehan	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—27

Berman	Klug	Quillen
Boucher	LaFalce	Shuster
Buyer	Lewis (CA)	Studds
Cox	Martinez	Thomas
Dickey	McHugh	Thornton
Dingell	McIntosh	Torricelli
Fields (LA)	Owens	Tucker
Johnston	Peterson (FL)	Waxman
Kaptur	Pickett	Weldon (PA)

□ 1212

Mr. MILLER of California changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 783, I was unavoidably detained outside the Chamber. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

□ 1215

REQUEST TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 118, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 118, a clean continuing resolution, and ask its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, and procedures recorded on page 534 of the House Rules Manual, the

Chair is constrained not to entertain the gentleman's request until it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I hope it is soon cleared, because that is what we need to do to avoid the Government shutting down on Monday.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on the resolution on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO DISPOSE OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 115, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of agreeing to House Resolution 261, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 182, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 784]

YEAS—223

Allard	Collins (GA)	Goodlatte
Archer	Combest	Gooding
Armey	Cooley	Goss
Bachus	Cox	Graham
Baker (CA)	Crane	Greenwood
Baker (LA)	Crapo	Gunderson
Ballenger	Creameans	Gutknecht
Barr	Cubin	Hall (TX)
Barrett (NE)	Cunningham	Hansen
Bartlett	Deal	Hastert
Barton	DeLay	Hastings (WA)
Bass	Diaz-Balart	Hayes
Bateman	Doolittle	Hayworth
Bereuter	Dornan	Hefley
Bilbray	Dreier	Heineman
Bilirakis	Duncan	Herger
Bliley	Dunn	Hilleary
Blute	Ehlers	Hobson
Boehlert	Ehrlich	Hoekstra
Boehner	Emerson	Hoke
Bonilla	English	Horn
Bono	Ensign	Hostettler
Brewster	Everett	Houghton
Brownback	Ewing	Hunter
Bryant (TN)	Fawell	Hutchinson
Bunn	Fields (TX)	Hyde
Bunning	Flanagan	Inglis
Burr	Foley	Istook
Burton	Forbes	Johnson (CT)
Callahan	Fowler	Johnson, Sam
Calvert	Fox	Jones
Camp	Franks (CT)	Kasich
Canady	Franks (NJ)	Kelly
Castle	Frelinghuysen	Kim
Chabot	Frisa	King
Chambliss	Funderburk	Kingston
Chenoweth	Gallagher	Knollenberg
Christensen	Ganske	Kolbe
Chrysler	Gekas	LaHood
Clinger	Gilchrest	Largent
Coble	Gillmor	Latham
Coburn	Gilman	LaTourette

Laughlin	Packard	Smith (WA)
Lazio	Parker	Solomon
Leach	Paxon	Souder
Lewis (KY)	Petri	Spence
Lightfoot	Pombo	Stearns
Linder	Porter	Stockman
Livingston	Portman	Stump
LoBiondo	Pryce	Talent
Longley	Quinn	Tate
Lucas	Radanovich	Tauzin
Manzullo	Ramstad	Taylor (NC)
Martini	Regula	Thomas
McCollum	Riggs	Thornberry
McCrery	Roberts	Torkildsen
McDade	Rogers	Upton
McInnis	Rohrabacher	Vucanovich
McIntosh	Ros-Lehtinen	Waldholtz
McKeon	Roth	Walker
Metcalfe	Royce	Walsh
Meyers	Salmon	Wamp
Mica	Sanford	Watts (OK)
Miller (FL)	Saxton	Weldon (FL)
Molinar	Scarborough	Weller
Moorhead	Schaefer	White
Morella	Schiff	Whitfield
Myers	Seastrand	Wicker
Myrick	Sensenbrenner	Wolf
Nethercutt	Shadegg	Young (AK)
Neumann	Shaw	Young (FL)
Ney	Skeen	Zeliff
Norwood	Smith (MI)	Zimmer
Nussle	Smith (NJ)	
Oxley	Smith (TX)	

NAYS—182

Abercrombie	Gejdenson	Nadler
Ackerman	Gephardt	Neal
Andrews	Geren	Oberstar
Baerle	Gibbons	Obey
Baldacci	Gonzalez	Oliver
Barcia	Gordon	Ortiz
Barrett (WI)	Green	Orton
Becerra	Gutierrez	Pallone
Beilenson	Hall (OH)	Pastor
Bentsen	Hamilton	Payne (NJ)
Bevill	Harman	Payne (VA)
Bishop	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Boniior	Hefner	Peterson (MN)
Borski	Hilliard	Pomeroy
Browder	Hinchey	Poshard
Brown (CA)	Holden	Rahall
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Rangel
Brown (OH)	Jackson-Lee	Reed
Bryant (TX)	Jacobs	Richardson
Cardin	Jefferson	Rivers
Chapman	Johnson (SD)	Roemer
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Rose
Clayton	Kanjorski	Roukema
Clement	Kennedy (MA)	Roybal-Allard
Clyburn	Kennedy (RI)	Rush
Coleman	Kennelly	Sabo
Collins (IL)	Kildee	Sanders
Collins (MI)	Klecza	Sawyer
Condit	Klink	Schroeder
Conyers	Lantos	Schumer
Costello	Levin	Scott
Coyne	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Cramer	Lincoln	Shays
Danner	Lipinski	Sisisky
Davis	Lofgren	Skaggs
de la Garza	Lowe	Skelton
DeFazio	Luther	Slaughter
DeLauro	Maloney	Spratt
Dellums	Manton	Stark
Deutsch	Markey	Stenholm
Dicks	Mascara	Stokes
Dixon	Matsui	Stupak
Doggett	McCarthy	Tanner
Dooley	McDermott	Taylor (MS)
Doyle	McHale	Tejeda
Durbin	McKinney	Thompson
Edwards	McNulty	Thurman
Engel	Meehan	Torres
Eshoo	Meek	Towns
Evans	Menendez	Trafigant
Farr	Mfume	Velazquez
Fattah	Miller (CA)	Vento
Fazio	Minge	Visclosky
Filner	Mink	Volkmer
Flake	Moakley	Ward
Foglietta	Mollohan	Waters
Frank (MA)	Montgomery	Watt (NC)
Frost	Moran	Williams
Furse	Murtha	

Wilson	Woolsey	Wynn
Wise	Wyden	Yates

NOT VOTING—27

Berman	Kaptur	Quillen
Boucher	Klug	Shuster
Buyer	LaFalce	Studds
Dickey	Lewis (CA)	Thornton
Dingell	Martinez	Tiaht
Fields (LA)	McHugh	Torricelli
Ford	Owens	Tucker
Hancock	Peterson (FL)	Waxman
Johnston	Pickett	Weldon (PA)

□ 1224

Ms. WATERS changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1963

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1963, and to delete my name from subsequent references and printings of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO DISPOSE OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 2586, TEMPORARY INCREASE IN THE STATUTORY DEBT LIMIT

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 262, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2586) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 262, the Senate amendment is considered as having been read.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Page 34, strike out line 1 and all that follows over to and including line 17 on page 251.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). Pursuant to House Resolution 262, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last night, the Senate considered and passed H.R. 2586, a temporary increase in the Government's borrowing authority, approving all of the provisions in the House bill that we sent over, except for the proposal

eliminating the Commerce Department.

The bill now contains the most crucial pieces that we approved yesterday: a downpayment on a balanced budget, a brighter future for our children, and the protection of Social Security and other Federal benefit trust funds.

Mr. Speaker, these protections are essential, because the Treasury Department right now is planning to raid the civil service trust fund as a circuit breaker to avoid breaching the debt limit. But this circuit breaker is really a high voltage wire that directly taps into retiree trust funds.

In time, the administration may be even tempted to raid the Social Security trust fund if, in fact, the President continues to stall and does not come to a resolution of the debt problem with this Congress.

Currently, the law does not protect the Social Security trust fund, but the provisions in this bill do. The provisions prevent the Secretary of the Treasury from ever raiding the Social Security trust funds.

Mr. Speaker, the administration may veto this bill, but the steps it takes to get around the legal limits on borrowing will be closely watched. If assets are taken from the funds, we will know it and we stand ready to protect retiree and other benefits.

This short-term extension is intended to provide the administration with the opportunity to have an orderly management of the debt until December 12, and opportunity for the President to join with us in negotiating a balanced budget bill.

Such a bill will include a permanent increase in the debt ceiling to accommodate the provisions of that bill. However, for the moment, we need to keep the pressure on the administration if we are to bring the differing views together and resolve this problem.

The time for delay is passed. No more excuses. We must stop passing our generation's debt on to our children and our grandchildren. We must face facts and bring our budget into balance.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake, in this bill, December 12 is the drop-dead date for the President to come to the table and negotiate in good faith on a plan to balance the budget in 7 years by CBO numbers, and without tax increases.

We are committed to do no less. It is our responsibility to our children and it has the support of 82 percent of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to protect the trust funds and vote to press on with the fight to balance the budget.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to hear a lot of fancy language and a lot of fancy arguments, but let me try at the beginning to explain what is going on. This debate today should never have taken place, had the Republican leadership had any ability to lead. The voters gave them a majority in this House of Representatives, a substantial majority. We just saw it on the last vote.

We are not delaying anything here. We are not postponing anything. This is just their inability to work in the Republican Party with themselves and get their act together and get legislation passed. They should have done this back in July. This is November 10.

Why have they been so long? Well, you will have to judge for yourself on that.

The piece of legislation we are actually debating here today and will vote on soon is still a piece of blackmail. It is an attempt to lure and to force the President to come and adopt their rather radical agenda, and he refuses to do so. It is an agenda that gives tax cuts to the very wealthy who have neither asked for them nor need them. It is an agenda that places the burden of balancing the budget on the sick, the aged, the children of America, the working poor, those least able to defend themselves or to support the sacrifices that need to be made to balance this budget.

The Republican Party's priorities are simply wrong. The President recognizes that. In addition to that, there had been no leadership from the Republican Party to get the regular business of this House conducted. Here we are, a month and a half after the end of the last fiscal year. We have not passed the appropriations bills that are necessary to run this Government. Only three of the bills have ever left this Chamber and left the Senate and headed for the President's desk. There are nine more floating around out there in limbo somewhere on which the Republicans are fighting amongst themselves about the bill. We do not control the vote. They have got the votes. The American people put them in charge, and that trust has been severely violated by ineptness.

So I regret that the bill that is here today and is the subject of the next vote is just another attempt to blackmail the President to come bargain with the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. DOLE, and yet they have not presented their own appropriations bills. They have not presented their own budget which they are still arguing over amongst themselves, and they are trying to place the blame on us.

Mr. Speaker, that is the simple truth of all that is going on here today. Members are going to hear a lot of fancy rhetoric about saving the trust funds. Baloney. They know that is baloney. The only reason anybody has to

raid the trust funds is to keep this Government from collapsing, from not paying its honest debts. That is all that is at stake today.

Mr. SPEAKER, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], chairman of the Committee on Science.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, what we are hearing from now are the debt junkies who for 40 years ran up trillions of dollars worth of debt and gave us the situation that we are now in and now are out complaining about the process. It is fascinating. They not only ran up trillions of dollars worth of debt, but they were the junkies that adopted what was called the Gephardt rule so that they put the entire debt of the United States on automatic pilot. So, anytime we had to have more debt, we simply passed and kind of deemed the debt to have been passed under the Gephardt rule.

These debt junkies would not even bring bills like this to the floor because they did not want to go through the agony of raising debt, and the debt swelled by trillions and trillions and trillions of dollars. And then what did we get from them? We got excuses: It is not our fault. Ronald Reagan made us do it.

Now the excuses today on the floor: Oh my goodness, the process does not work the way we would like it to work. And so we now have a new excuse.

Then when all the excuses were gone and when people began to recognize they were debt junkies, then what happened is they turned to gimmicks. You have the Secretary of the Treasury out doing the PR gimmick here for several weeks trying to scare the markets. When that did not work, now what they have got is their newest gimmick. Their newest gimmick is to actually raid the trust funds, to raid the retirement trust funds of the United States, including as a potential the Social Security trust funds.

The gentleman from Florida tells us that is not what is happening. Well, USA Today does not agree. In fact, USA Today this morning runs a headline that says, retirement accounts could be tapped to avert default. So it is very clear that the news media, the American people, everyone is now understanding that, if we do not pass this bill in the form we bring it here today, we are putting in jeopardy the trust fund accounts of the United States, that the Democrats, because they are debt junkies, are perfectly willing.

Vote no more excuses, no more gimmicks. Pass this bill.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for a ques-

tion. That is, has any Democrat proffered putting the Istook amendment, for instance, on the CR? We know that is the reason the CR is held up. What Democrat had anything to do with that? This is a fight between Republicans, not us.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman might want to check the CR when it comes out here later on. The Istook amendment will not be on it.

Mr. SCHUMER. The RECORD will show that that is what has held it up. That is the reason we are here. I am glad that side has shown some leadership to tell the gentleman from Oklahoma he should not be holding this up.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have been in this body a number of years. I thought I had learned a few truisms. I thought there were certain things I could rely on. One of them was that this country never, never should default, that our debt is money spent, money owed, that the full faith and credit of the United States was involved.

Yet this morning I read in some of the papers the financiers of Wall Street are saying it really is not going to be catastrophic if we default. These statements absolutely perplex me. Do these financiers think that the President of the United States, Mr. Clinton, would never default, so they can make these statements? Are these financiers trying to ingratiate themselves to the leadership of this House?

I do not know what they are trying to do. I only can say to these individuals, men and women on Wall Street, you have the investments in your hands, pension funds and mutual funds. You should know better than to say default is not going to be catastrophic.

I stand here right now and say this House should be doing one thing, passing a clean debt ceiling. In the meantime, we could hammer out a budget that could get 218 votes.

This Member would be perfectly willing and there are other Democratic Members who would join with Republican Members for a clean debt ceiling, and this should happen. Let us be clear. We are going to have a budget, and we are going to raise the debt ceiling. But I do caution those people who should know better. We should not even talk about default, let alone play about it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Senate-passed debt ceiling extension. While I strongly support the Senate's action in dropping elimination of the Commerce Department, this bill is still overburdened with unrelated matters.

What the House should be doing today is passing a clean temporary debt ceiling as an

interim measure to prevent default while a balanced budget agreement can be hammered out.

While it may be true that the majority cannot, in fact, pass a debt ceiling without conditions or riders, no one should lose sight of the fact that many Democrats, including this Member, would support a clean extension simply because the cost of default is too high. And the President has said he would sign one. Yesterday six former Treasury Secretaries sent a letter to the Speaker and Senate Majority Leader DOLE asking for a clean debt ceiling.

When all is said and done, the debt ceiling will be increased. We shouldn't hold the economy or average American families hostage to a partisan debate on a balanced budget. We should enact an extension in the debt ceiling immediately.

Let's be clear, raising the debt ceiling has nothing to do with the current level of Government spending, and everything to do with financing our prior obligations—living up to our commitments. There is no doubt that the debt ceiling will be raised in the long run. Let's stop playing games and pass a bipartisan clean debt ceiling.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentlewoman has spoken to exactly what the bill is about, to permit the orderly management of the debt until December 12. There is nothing in this bill that says default. What it says is that on December 12 we will have a problem if the President will not come forward, exercise leadership and negotiate with this Congress for a balanced budget in 7 years by CBO numbers without tax increases.

There is plenty of time for that to happen. The President has within his hands the ability to negotiate with us and to eliminate any possible threat of default, but he has yet to be forthcoming in this regard.

The truly important thing for the future is to get this budget balanced. Canada has its problems today because it did not balance its budget. Sweden has its problems today because it did not balance its budget. We cannot continue to let these interest service charges creep up and up and up because they will ultimately be the culprit in default in the long run. We have plenty of opportunity to get this budget balanced, and we are determined to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH], a respected member of the committee.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this debt limit extension, especially in view of the strong restrictions it includes against the raid of the Social Security trust fund assets.

Three million people depend on Social Security each month to meet their basic living expenses. They paid for these benefits while they were working. They should not have to worry about whether their checks are going

□ 1245

to be paid during a debt limit crisis or whether the assets of the trust funds will be gamed or raided in order to keep the Government running.

Mr. Speaker, the Social Security trust funds held \$483 billion in assets as of September 30. That is a huge and an alluring pot of money right now in this crisis. The bill we are considering maintains public confidence in Social Security. It prevents a repeat of what happened in 1985 when the trust funds were disinvested to get around the debt limit. It makes it absolutely clear that these assets may not be used for any other purpose other than to pay Social Security benefits or related administrative costs.

The bill also makes it clear that Social Security checks will be paid to seniors on time even during a debt limit crisis when a shutdown of the Government is being threatened.

The administration claims it will not use Social Security assets to pay the bills, but the public record is littered with their zigs and zags on important public policy questions, as our colleagues on the other side of the aisle know better than anyone. This bill protects Social Security from disinvestment and does so on a permanent basis. The law currently does not do that. This bill preserves the social compact between generations that Social Security represents.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to my colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, there is nothing you can do that will mask what you are doing here. Nothing.

The Social Security argument is a complete sham. The gentleman was there when the Treasury Secretary assured, through his representatives, this country under no circumstances will touch Social Security. The gentleman got up here and made that argument.

It is a sham. Look, we are also talking about the debt. We could stand here and argue for hours who caused the debt. I was here during many, many sessions when we passed bills less than the Republican President asked. During the 1980's, the total amount that was spent was less than requested by Republican Presidents.

That is not what the public wants to argue about or hear about. They are impatient with you. You are playing politics with their checkbooks. You are playing brinkmanship. It is not pressure. It is a pistol you are putting to the head of the presidency. And who will suffer if you succeed, if there is default? Those who have adjustable mortgages, those who have credit card payments to make. Your extremism is already seeping into the attitudes of the public, and that is why they reject this Republican Congress. The Speaker should not blame the freshmen.

He is the leader of that gang. He is the pied piper. He is going to lead his troops over the edge and take our colleagues with him, but the trouble is he will take the country, and all the taxpayers and the hard-working families with him, and that is why in the end our colleagues' brinkmanship will fail. It is a miserable tactic shrouded with miserable arguments. Turn down this miserable bill.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, if it is extremism to meet ones financial obligations, then there are extreme people on our side of the aisle. If it is extremism to pay one's debts, then we are extremists. If it is extremism to make Government accountable and responsible, then we are extremists.

I chair the House Civil Service Committee. I have only done that for a few months, and let me tell my colleagues about the mess we inherited. As my colleagues know, we have approximately 39 Federal retirement programs, and Congress has raided every retirement cookie jar. Thirty-five of the thirty-nine Federal retirement programs are already raided. There are no funds in them. Two funds, the Federal employee retirement trust fund and the military trust fund have unfunded liability of over a trillion dollars, and that is not counted in the \$1½ trillion national debt. So now they are telling us that retirement accounts are their next avenue of irresponsibility, and that is only part of the problem. We are paying \$19.8 billion out of the Treasury to meet the current benefits for our Federal employees and another \$24 billion every year to pay the interest on the money we stole from the account. So now they found one more account, one more bastion of irresponsibility, and I tell my colleagues that we cannot continue the funny book-keeping that we have inherited.

Even the President summed it up, and that is what this debate is all about. He said it: "I taxed you too much and I cut too little." If we are going to run this country \$67 billion more in debt for 34 days and make every man, woman, and child in this country pay for those 34 days another \$269 just for that short period of time for that debt we are extending, then we should have fiscal responsibility, and we should end the ways of the past.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me make it clear. To the extent that there is any risk to our trust funds, to the extent that there is a risk as to whether we will honor our debt, to the extent that whether there is a risk as to whether we are able to continue essen-

tial services, that falls to the Republicans' failure to bring to this floor a clean extension of our debt ceiling, and let me explain the hypocrisy of the Republicans here. Their budget calls for an increase, an increase in our national debt authority of \$600 billion. They have already approved it on the House floor. They have already approved it on the Senate floor. But we have not brought to the President an agreed budget that includes that \$600 billion, so we do not have that authority here today.

Now why do we not have that \$600 billion additional authority? Because the Republicans have missed the deadline. The deadline was October 1 to get their budget passed and to the President. They missed that deadline, they missed it badly, and now we run up against the debt ceiling, and we are being asked to extend it by about one-tenth of the permanent amount that is in their budget, a little over \$60 billion, and the Republicans say, "Wait a minute. We want to put all types of conditions on that extension that aren't acceptable to the President."

Mr. Speaker, the President is not at fault that we have not met our deadlines. It is the Republican leadership's fault, and yet they are trying to use process here on attaching legislation that is wrong, that when they took the leadership of this House they said they would not do, and they are doing it here today, and it is wrong, and the Republicans are putting at risk the credit of this country. The Republicans are putting at risk our trust funds and our ability to pay the obligations of this country, and that is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, we have said from our side of the aisle bring a clean debt extension and we will support it, but this bill is wrong. It should be defeated.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK].

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. I would just like to state very briefly that I am going to vote for the temporary debt ceiling even though it does not contain the elimination of the Department of Commerce, which I think is a very key and important thing for us to do in producing a smaller, more limited, more focused Federal Government, and this is something that this House has already agreed to and voted for. We received assurances from the Senate leadership that they will push for the elimination of the Department of Commerce the next available opportunity this year, so I urge my colleagues to vote for this temporary debt ceiling as we continue to move forward and we do what the country is asking, and that is just a very simple thing of what everybody else has to do, and it is balance the budget. I sit here on this floor, and I listen to the debate, and it seems to me it is terribly harsh about something that we

have been negligent in doing for so many years, and that is just simply balancing the budget, and I would urge the American people to look past the rhetoric and say, "Yes, you have got to do it. You have got to deliver, and you've got to deliver a balanced budget." This is a critical step to be able to accomplish that goal.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, actions being taken by this Congress are a frontal attack on Medicare. By continuing to insist on a short-term debt increase that ties the hands of the President, Congress is putting the U.S. Government and its good name at risk.

Repeatedly, we have heard that the House passed budget would protect and save Medicare. Well, the actions taken here the last few days put Medicare at great risk.

Medicare does not need to be put at risk or even involved in this debate. The solution is simple. Bring a clean debt extension to the floor.

This legislation includes a payment priority system, which is nothing but an unnecessary political ploy. And yes, this ploy can harm Medicare. The reason for this scheme is to protect Social Security. Social Security is already protected. The Social Security trust funds will not be used for any purpose other than to assure the payment of benefits to Social Security recipients.

Medicare should be protected. If Treasury is forced to prioritize payments, the nonpriority payments such as Medicare will not be paid. Why are we pulling the rug out from under seniors? They rely on Medicare and they expect payments to be made.

If you really want to save and protect Medicare, you will pass a clean debt extension.

Isn't it ironic that we are here on Veterans Day and we are debating legislation that could result in the failure of benefits being paid to veterans.

The debt ceiling legislation before us plays a dangerous game that is deadly to seniors. This legislation will put the U.S. Government in default if the President does not sign the budget.

We all know very well that the President cannot sign this budget. Congress is way behind. The budget conference has not had one public session. Conferees on my side of the aisle are waiting to be contacted. Over half the 13 annual appropriations bills have not been sent to the President.

The Republicans are putting Medicare at extreme risk. This legislation will put the United States into default. Once the Government defaults, Medicare benefits will not be paid.

Treasury has been acting responsibly and already taken steps to avoid default, because of Congress' failure to pass a debt limit increase.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY].

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am just a freshman that came here this year, but as somebody who served in local government and was close to the people for over 20 years as a representative, the citizens kept asking, "Why can't Washington produce a balanced budget," and now I understand after I have been here why Washington has not been able to do it, because there are always good excuses for voting no against a balanced budget, there is always some detail that is more important than balancing the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we need to recognize that we are talking about something that everybody talks about but are not willing to do. I will not yield at this time, but, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege to be able to celebrate with my daughter her birthday this week, and she would not know and does not know what a balanced budget means to her future, but there are people across this country that have children that are going to be moving into the market at the beginning of the next century, and there are children that are going to be graduating from high school in the year 2003, like my Briana and my Patrick, and all I ask this body to do is find reasons to say yes so their graduation present, Mr. Speaker, can be a balanced budget for their future.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] that this is not a balanced budget. Our colleagues are borrowing more money because they are not balancing the budget.

Now I love going home just as much as my colleague loves going home, but I think it is more important to stay here and balance the budget than to borrow more money.

When I was in the gentleman's shoes exactly 6 years ago right now, I got a call from the Bush White House, and they asked me to vote for a one-time extension to the debt, and I honored then President Bush's request.

Dog bit me once, dog's fault. Dog bites me twice, it is my fault. I will not vote again to raise the debt limit because this is not a balanced budget. If it was balanced, we would not be borrowing more money.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would say I would rather stay here this week and this month to have a balanced budget than to go to all the birthday parties in the world.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for yielding this time to me, and I want to tell my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, in fact I would be happy to have a colloquy about this particular issue, this debate is all about balancing the Federal budget, try, as you might, to obscure it with discussion about the content of the continuing resolution or, for that matter, the debt ceiling increase, and I want to point out to the American people that only 72 Democrats, 72 out of 199, voted for a balanced budget when the Democratic substitute was offered on this floor by the so-called Blue Dog Coalition. In fact the Democrat minority leader, the Democrat minority whip, both voted against the Democrat version of a balanced budget. The majority of Members speaking over there today have voted against the balanced budget and have yet to vote for a balanced budget in this Congress.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am, as the gentleman knows, one of those Democrats that voted for a balanced budget amendment, voted for the Stenholm budget, voted for the coalition balanced budget amendment which gets us to the balanced budget by 2002 and, in fact, cuts more money, as my colleague knows, faster than the Republican alternative.

Having said that, I do not believe this is a responsible thing for us to do, to put at risk the credit of the United States when we clearly know we do not have agreement between the President and ourselves. However, we do have agreement on getting to a balanced budget by the President and ourselves. Once we pass the appropriation bills, we will do that.

□ 1300

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, am one of those who voted to balance our budget when that recently came before this House. Yesterday we offered a motion to recommit that was very simple. It would have altered the debt limit provided for by 30 days. It would have provided a window that would say that from the time the reconciliation bill hits the President's desk until we reach the debt ceiling limit, there would be a 30-day period in which we could work in a bipartisan way to develop a plan that will balance the Federal budget and would avoid a default by the Federal Government.

It was a clean motion. It was written on a single piece of paper. It was written without any kind of partisan distractions. It was said by my friends on the other side that our motion could be an indefinite extension of the debt. Let us be clear, the only way that motion could allow for an indefinite extension of the debt limit is if the majority in the Congress failed to present the President with a reconciliation bill. That is the only way, period.

It was also said that our motion would somehow allow the Treasury Department to raid the Social Security trust funds during this period. This just is not true. The Treasury has already stated in clear and certain terms that it will not touch the Social Security trust fund in its effort to manage the Federal debt.

I say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, we could end this controversy right here and now by rejecting this debt limit bill, and send to the other body the motion to recommit that we took up yesterday instead. We could pass this clean language and not risk a Presidential veto. We could give a great Christmas present to the American people, one that I believe they had on the very top of their list last November. That is, Democrats and Republicans, working together in a bipartisan fashion, passing a reconciliation bill which balances the Federal budget without partisan rancor and without placing the creditworthiness of this country at risk.

Vote against this bill. Let us pass a clean bill and get on with the business of balancing our budget.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to get involved in this discussion today, but after a phone call from a constituent this morning, concerning whether or not she should remove her savings from Treasury notes and Treasury bonds and CD's, it suddenly occurred to me that this game that we are playing today is one that could be very harmful to a lot of unintended people.

It is true, December 12, we could be doing this between now and then. My fear is that we have spent 314 days getting us nowhere. We have 300 votes on this floor to balance the budget next week. The argument that this is required to get us to a balanced budget is purely political. We have the votes. It seems to me that we are missing something, but the people are not. We are missing it on the floor, particularly with my friends on this side. We have not done our work. The Congress has not, in a bipartisan way, delivered to the President 13 appropriation bills and a reconciliation bill so that the President can say whether he is for or against it.

Though some will say, "He should be weighing in already," I am on the con-

ference, I have not been consulted 1 second. I got a call from the president of the largest farm organization in Texas yesterday asking me, "Charlie, I hear we are getting close to a farm bill. What is in it?" I say, "Mr. Stallman, I have no idea." I confronted the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture this morning and asked him, "What is going on?" And he said, "Charlie, if I knew, you would be the first to know if you would just ask me." Committee chairmen do not know what is in the bills that are coming before us in this heated debate.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we could get away from some of this political rhetoric that is now occurring. If I have misspoken, and I would be happy to yield to any of my friends on the other side of the aisle, if I have said anything, I would be glad to have a discussion, as we had between the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] just a moment ago. But it seems to me that we are playing an unneeded political game, risking the good faith and credit of the United States in order to prove a political point. It seems to me the risk is not worth it.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I simply want to point out that the President apparently, based on his recent statements, has come around to the belief that we can in fact balance the budget in 7 years. As the gentleman well knows, there is language in this debt ceiling increase, or debt ceiling extension legislation, that effectively commits the President to balancing the budget in 7 years, based on a CBO-certified plan.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, if I could reclaim my time, that is totally irrelevant to the discussion today. What we should do today is do our work, and then get on with the negotiations. That is irrelevant.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, every Republican has voted for a debt ceiling extension to \$5.5 trillion until September 1997. What we need to do is to simply pull that out of the reconciliation bill, pass it, and keep this Government on an even keel. There is no discussion about where the debt ought to be lifted to. It should be lifted to \$5.5 trillion until September 1997. Every single Republican has agreed with that.

The problem is that you have added additional very harmful provisions within this debt ceiling bill. I want to address these. These provisions were enacted by President Reagan in 1987.

That is the last time we had the most serious debt ceiling crisis. President Reagan signed into law provisions that would make sure that our financial markets would not collapse, that we would not go through the same kind of thing we went through back in the 1980's, largely because of the tax cuts that ultimately created a grossly unbalanced budget. I am not going to go into the reasons for that. The point is we figured out how to correct it and not let it happen again.

This debt ceiling extension takes away those provisions. There is an article in the Post today. It says: "Financial analysts say the United States is unlikely to default," and it talks about how base they all are. The reason they are is because they are assuming that those provisions enacted in 1987 are still law; in other words, we can borrow from other trust funds so as to get us by a crisis. Then there is a law that requires that that money be paid back to those trust funds.

This debt ceiling bill repeals those provisions. That is why it has to be defeated. That is why it has to be vetoed. One of those laws says that we can go into the civil service retirement trust fund and borrow that money, only on condition that it legally has to be repaid. We cannot do that under this law. In fact, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service wrote to the Federal Retirement Thrift Board, knowing that they are nonpartisan, there are a number of Republicans on it, and I assume that he thought he would get support for this bill.

They wrote back, and I am glad he is coming to the floor, and they said that if this debt ceiling bill is passed as currently written, Federal employees will lose \$3.5 million a day from their fund, because this debt ceiling bill does not allow us to repay that fund. It takes away these provisions that were designed to get us past this crisis. That is the problem.

Another thing it does, incidentally, and I think we ought to mention this, because we are honoring Veterans Day, it does not even allow us to pay veterans benefits if it pushes us into this kind of crisis situation.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, first I want to address my words to the person, I believe, in this country who has worked the hardest for the last 2 years to bring our economy to the great economic conditions that we have today. That is our President of the United States, Bill Clinton. I also want to remind everybody that he is a very conscientious person that thinks great things about this country and how well this country can do. What the Republican leadership

is now proposing to do is to put him on the hot spot, to say, "If you veto this, then we may have a default in our bonds, in our Treasury notes, and the economy may go to blazes."

Mr. President, I want to tell you that I stand here today urging you to veto this lousy bill. I know, Mr. President, that you have said you would sign a clean, no-strings-attached, debt limit bill, that you would sign one even for a short period of time. But that is not what you are being faced with. No, the Republican leadership, led by his imperial majesty, Speaker GINGRICH, has decided that they are going to do a little blackmail, extortion, play the game of chicken. That is what the Speaker has brought us to.

I am not voting for it. No way. I feel too much for this great country of ours, like our President. I would not want to bring us to this brink of disaster for this country, just to prove a point that you are going to have to sign other bills that have been attached onto the debt limit bill.

Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said on this floor about what goes on back home. Back home, for years I have heard people complain about putting extraneous bills on top of other bills that do not belong on there. That is just what we have here today. That is just what this is, Mr. Speaker; nothing more, nothing less. If the President will sign a straight debt limit bill, why do we not send him a straight debt limit bill?

Because you do not want to do that. You want to try and make him sign a bill with a whole bunch of extraneous stuff on it that has nothing to do with a debt limit, has nothing to do with a balanced budget, in order to try to embarrass him. That is all it is, pure politics. You are playing politics with the greatness of this country. I do not know if you realize it or not, but we could have a lot of harm done to this country and the people of it simply because you want to play politics. Mr. President, veto the bill.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, let us call it the way it is. Let us stop the charade here. What is going on here is Presidential politics and cheap politics at its worst. The attempt to embarrass the President of the United States, or to blackmail the President of the United States, is really not worthy of this great body.

If the Republican leadership were indeed serious about tackling the problem with the debt-limit extension, or the continuing resolution, we would be voting on clean bills, stripped down bills today that would do exactly that. No one disagrees with the fact that the debt limit has to be extended, or that

there needs to be a continuing resolution, but the attempt to junk it up, to pump it up with all kinds of things that do not belong in the bill to push the continued extreme Republican agenda is really not worthy of this institution.

Let me say to my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle that a couple of polls came out today. The polls show that the American people have finally caught on to the Republican shell game, to the irresponsible shell game. Fifty-nine percent is the President's approval rating, the highest in a year and a half.

Sixty percent of the American people say that the President ought to veto the extreme Republican budget. In a generic question about whom would you vote for for Congress, Democrats or Republicans, the American people chose Democrats by a total of 50 to 44 percent.

The American people are not fools. The American people know where to point the finger if the Government should shut down. It is totally irresponsible to even be playing this game of brinksmanship. Let us sit down, put our heads together, work out a budget, work out differences on issues, but let us not hold America hostage. Let us not hold this debt-limit extension hostage, or the continuing resolution hostage. Let us have some responsibility. Vote no on this miserable bill.

□ 1315

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues of the House, it is true that Republicans on three occasions have unanimously voted to up the debt limit to \$5.5 trillion through September 1997. That is not the issue here. The issue is to try to jam the President of the United States, as I have said before.

Now, let me read a letter dated November 9, 1995, just 2 days ago. This is not a partisan issue. I quote from that letter:

While we may have differing views on the merits of the various issues being raised in the budget debate, we share the strong view that the debt limit should not be, should not be, should not be, embroiled in that debate. We urge that prompt action be taken to either raise the debt limit permanently to a level that would accommodate either of the budgets being proposed, or that a sufficient short-term increase be enacted to allow the debate over priorities to proceed in an orderly manner without impairing market confidence in our Nation's commitment to discharge its obligations.

Who signed that letter? Secretary Bentsen, Secretary under Clinton. Secretary Blumenthal, Secretary of the Treasury under Carter. Secretary George Shultz, Secretary of Labor and Secretary of the Treasury under Nixon and Secretary of State under Ronald Reagan. Secretary G. William Miller,

Secretary of the Treasury under Carter. William E. Simon, Secretary of the Treasury under President Nixon and President Ford; and Secretary Fowler, Secretary under President Johnson.

In a letter dated June 28, 1990, from Secretary Brady, he said, "I urge the Congress to act in a timely manner on a debt limit increase in order," he said, "to avert a default with its adverse consequences on domestic and international confidence and trust in the United States."

Be responsible. Reject this bill.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, again, let us just be honest about what is going on here. We on the Democratic side are sort of innocent bystanders. What is going on is that Republicans cannot agree with Republicans. You have some people in this House, about 80, who do not care if we default, who brought in four experts to say, default does not matter, despite the fact that everybody else knows that you are playing with fire. Instead, they want to use the debt ceiling as a vehicle for their extremist ideology.

First, as has been said, the American people do not buy that ideology, and that is why they need the debt ceiling, because they cannot do it alone. A stand-alone bill will never pass. But second, it is playing with fire. The Senate realized you were playing with fire, House Republicans; that is why they stripped the bill of so many things.

Many on your side realize you are playing with fire. Now, get with it. Pass a clean debt ceiling, and let us have the ideological debates on substantive bills where they should be.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, enough has already been said about this. This is an attempt to blackmail the President, to come bargain with the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. DOLE, who have failed to get the necessary budget documents to him. They should have been there months ago. Yet they are here complaining, Mr. President, come bargain with us, lead us out of this swamp that we have gotten ourselves in.

I am for a debt ceiling increase. Every Republican in this Congress has voted, probably three times already this year, to increase the debt ceiling to \$5.5 trillion which will take us into 1997. This whole debate today is just a charade. If they would just do as they are supposed to do and what they are required to do, all of this could be done. The Government would not have to be closed down. They are trying to hold a pistol to the President's head to make him bargain, and they are not even ready to bargain. They have not

even presented their own chips on all of this.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I shall not consume that much time, and I know that that will come as a relief to everybody on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a couple of points to my colleagues today. We have heard that this is playing political games, that this is just partisan politics. We are taking the political easy way out. None of us believes that. Had it been politically easy, it would have been done years ago.

Balancing this budget is not easy. It is one of the most difficult things that this Congress has had to come to grips with in the 25 years that I have been here. The politics, if there is any, is to continue to sweep under the rug until after the next election the tough decisions. I personally do not think that is good enough for my children and my grandchildren.

It has been said what we are doing is wrong. What is wrong about trying to get to a balanced budget, a real balanced budget? By CBO numbers, the real numbers, the tough numbers, we are shooting real bullets when we talk about balancing the budget in 7 years by CBO numbers. We hear the hyperbole and the extreme rhetoric which I find frankly offensive and inappropriate.

When we are called terrorists, particularly coming on the heels of that tragic event that occurred in Israel, and the people of Israel know the meaning of the world terrorist, and that offensive rhetoric has been hurled by the other side at us. Early in the year as we moved toward trying to make these tough decisions, to be called Nazis and Hitler is highly offensive to me, and inappropriate, and does not belong out of the mouth of a Member of this Congress.

But we move on in this very, very difficult job, and I understand that this is not Democrat or Republican. When children are born into the world today, they are not born as Democrats or Republicans. As they grow up, they make the decision in which party they wish to identify, or perhaps no party at all. But each one of them is the recipient of the curse that we place on their heads by refusing to take the tough road of a balanced budget. I do commend my colleagues on the Democrat side who have been willing to vote for a tough balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, we should act as Americans concerned for the future. I have said earlier, and I am going to say it again, I had a grandson last week. I am very proud of that little fellow, but he came into this world with an obligation of \$187,000 on his head to pay the interest on this existing national debt for the rest of his life. We should not elevate that one dollar. Unfortunately,

the glidepath to get into balance where we do not have to borrow any more will cause us to borrow some additional money.

As the gentleman from Virginia said, we voted for \$5.5 trillion debt ceiling increase, and that is right. But I say to my friend from Virginia, it was coupled with a balanced budget by the year 2002 by CBO numbers. And yes, we are applying the pressure by our drop-dead December 12 date. But that pressure does not apply just to the President; it applies to us in the Congress. Both of us are being put under pressure to come together and to resolve the most difficult thing that we have undertaken in the 25 years that I have been in the Congress of the United States.

We know, every one of us who has been in any legislative body, whether it is in the State of whether it is here, we will not make the tough decisions until we are forced against the wall to do it. That has been a problem in every democracy. Socrates, 400 years before Christ, said that, when the masses of the people find they can vote themselves prosperity out of the public Treasury, democracy is no longer possible. Democracies have this frailty.

We must find a way to apply even pressure to the White House and to the Congress to force us together at the bargaining table. I say to Members, my friends on both sides of the aisle, that a month is enough. We have waited long enough. We know all of the pieces in the puzzle. All we have to do is sit down and negotiate a balanced budget by CBO numbers in 7 years without new taxes.

We invite the President to come and do this in good faith, but we will never resolve this problem unless the Congress and the President come together. I say to my friend from Texas, it is not just bipartisanship in the Congress, it is the President coming to join with the Congress. We all know what happened this year. He started the year with his budget.

In our committee, and the members of our committee know this, his Secretary said a balanced budget is unimportant. We are not going to balance a budget. It is unimportant. Then he finally came around and said, well, I cannot be for a balanced budget constitutional amendment. Show me your plan, you cannot do it. And we did it. I say, to the credit of the Democrats who voted for their alternative balanced budget, they did it too. But the President did not think we could do it in the Congress.

Then, when he saw we could do it, he came back and he said, well, I will be for a 10-year balanced budget by my OMB numbers, not CBO numbers. And yet he stood right here at this point and told the Congress on February 17, 1993, that the CBO numbers were the only real numbers, and that the American people were entitled to know that

we worked off of the same numbers. But now he has gone back to the rosy scenario on the stage with OMB. He does not balance the budget by CBO numbers in 10 years under OMB. He leaves \$200 billion a year in deficit. But that is the last proposal we have seen from the President.

Mr. President, please, please, come with us, and work with us to get this job done. And yes, the pressure is on both of us. We can do it by December 12. This is not game playing, this is conscientious effort to force a resolution for the most historic thing that we can do for our children and their children.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, when I was sent to Congress, my top priority was balancing the Federal budget. The people of the 49th district told me over and over again that Washington's practice of leaving our children debt, instead of a brighter future, was unacceptable.

The new majority in Congress heard this resounding mandate from the public, and we acted. We submitted the first balanced budget since 1969. President Clinton did not submit a balanced budget.

Now we are faced with a stalemate between Congress and the President. I know that there is considerable public anger over what some may see as gridlock. However, I believe that this debate is about principles versus agendas.

In our 7 year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act, our tax cuts for working families were offset by reducing the growth of non-entitlement spending, while continuing on the glidepath to a balanced budget. We also eliminated the subsidy to the wealthiest senior citizens participating in Medicare part B—single seniors with incomes over \$75,000 and couples with incomes over \$125,000 will begin to pay higher premiums.

President Clinton refuses to embrace our commitment to the principle that we will no longer tolerate mortgaging our children's future; we promised to balance the budget and we kept that promise. President Clinton's agenda is diverting attention from the indisputable fact that he does not support a balanced budget.

The Republican proposal for Medicare part B is included our measure to keep the Government running through December 1. President Clinton's states that his specific objection, and the reason for his veto of this measure, was over Medicare part B.

Medicare part B is the voluntary program which covers doctor's visits and outpatient care. Because the program is voluntary beneficiaries have not paid into a trust fund, as they have for Medicare part A, the hospital portion. Under current law, beneficiaries pay 31.5 percent of the premium for part B. Taxpayers subsidize the rest of the premium.

What we are proposing is to maintain the percentage at its current level—31.5 percent. Because the costs of the program will rise next year, as they have every year, the dollar amount will rise from \$46.10 to approximately \$53 in 1996—an approximately \$8 per month increase.

However, President Clinton is actually advocating dropping the percentage that premiums are calculated at to 25 percent and then raising them substantially again after the 1996 elections. The President is playing election year politics with the Medicare part B issue. He would cut revenues—by dropping the percentage to 25 percent—and then would have to raise the percentage again in order to make up for this shortfall. This is highly irresponsible.

Not only does President Clinton oppose a balanced budget, but this position on Medicare part B means that he believes taxpayers should subsidize a higher share—75 percent—of the costs of this voluntary program. It is exactly this logic which has resulted in the inevitable insolvency of the Medicare program is nothing is done to save it.

We have remained steadfast to the principle of our balanced budget; President Clinton has resorted to a diversionary political agenda rather than negotiating in good faith with Republicans. Nothing less than the future we leave to our children is at stake.

The American people, who sent us here in the first place, know this and, I believe, support our efforts on our children's behalf.

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in urging my colleagues to vote in favor of the motion to recommit, let me take a moment to address potential arguments that those on the other side of the aisle may raise against the motion.

Congressman SAM GIBBONS and I are offering a motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with instruction. As I have explained, the motion's instruction to the Ways and Means Committee is to amend the bill to provide a clean, temporary increase in the debt ceiling until either December 12—the same date as in the Republican bill—or the 30th day after a budget reconciliation bill is presented to the President for his signature, whichever is later.

First, our Republican colleagues may argue that the amendment would provide an unlimited period of time for the President to delay. That is incorrect. The amendment would raise the debt limit for a finite period of 30 days beginning as soon as a budget reconciliation bill is sent to the President for his signature. If a bill were ready today and sent to the President, the clock would start ticking today and stop ticking 30 days from now. The President's response to the bill would not affect the 30-day limit in any way. That 30-day period would allow us to put forth our best efforts to come together on the shared goal of a balanced budget. Our amendment is not indefinite and open ended. What seems to be indefinite and open ended is the ability of the Republican majority that controls this House to produce either a clean interest in the debt ceiling without partisan add ons or a budget bill.

Second, our Republican colleagues may argue that the amendment would give the Treasury Department a blank check to increase the debt limit to whatever level it wishes. That is incorrect. The amendment would raise the debt ceiling to exactly the same level as that in the Republican debt bill. If a budget is not presented to the President in a timely way, then a higher amount would be allowed and in that case the higher amount would be

limited to only what is necessary to pay our bills in the intervening days. The amendment in the motion to recommit would raise the debt limit cleanly, that is, without extraneous provisions of any kind. This suggested amendment is the businesslike approach that the American people deserve to the current regrettable, and avoidable, impasse.

Third, our Republican colleagues may argue that the amendment would grant permission to the Treasury to raid retirement trust funds. That is incorrect. In fact, in the case of the civil service retirement fund this amendment would restore the current-law protections for Federal retirees and workers that the Republican bill would destroy. Current law requires that any funds used from civil service pension funds and retirement savings accounts to see ourselves through a debt limit crisis, such as the one we now face, must be reimbursed with interest. Today this reimbursement is automatic. The Republican debt limit bill would take away that protection by repealing the requirement for automatic reimbursement of these funds with interest. My Democratic colleagues and I think that is wrong. Our amendment would protect Federal retirees and workers from that injustice. Regarding Social Security, the Secretary of the Treasury has said that he will not use funds from the Social Security trust fund for any purpose other than paying Social Security benefits. Social Security beneficiaries are fully protected. Period. Those on the other side of the aisle would be dead wrong to suggest otherwise.

Fourth, our Republican colleagues may argue that the amendment would jeopardize the orderly process of managing our Nation's debt and honoring our Nation's commitments. That is incorrect. Our amendment would do exactly the opposite. The orderly way to proceed with these discussions about the best path to a balanced budget is to allow a clean, temporary increase in the debt ceiling unadorned by partisan add ons. That is precisely what our amendment would do. It is precisely that orderly process that the Republican majority disrupts by insisting that temporary debt increase include partisan add ons.

I hope that our colleagues across the aisle will give our motion to recommit a careful reading. It provides an opportunity to all of us to work together rationally toward a balanced budget rather than to contribute to the atmosphere of partisanship and distrust. Again, I urge a vote in favor of the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). All time has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 262, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 185, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 785]

YEAS—219

Archer	Funderburk	Morella
Armey	Galleghy	Myers
Bachus	Ganske	Myrick
Baker (CA)	Gekas	Nethercutt
Baker (LA)	Gilchrest	Neumann
Ballenger	Gillmor	Ney
Barr	Gilman	Norwood
Barrett (NE)	Goodlatte	Nussle
Bartlett	Goss	Oxley
Barton	Graham	Packard
Bass	Greenwood	Parker
Bateman	Gunderson	Paxon
Bereuter	Gutknecht	Petri
Bilbray	Hall (TX)	Pombo
Billirakis	Hancock	Porter
Billiey	Hansen	Portman
Blute	Hastert	Pryce
Boehlert	Hastings (WA)	Quinn
Boehner	Hayes	Radanovich
Bonilla	Hayworth	Ramstad
Bono	Hefley	Regula
Brewster	Heineman	Riggs
Brownback	Herger	Roberts
Bryant (TN)	Hilleary	Rogers
Bunning	Hobson	Rohrabacher
Burton	Hoekstra	Ros-Lehtinen
Callahan	Hoke	Roth
Calvert	Horn	Roukema
Camp	Hostettler	Royce
Canady	Houghton	Salmon
Castle	Hunter	Sanford
Chabot	Hutchinson	Saxton
Chambliss	Hyde	Scarborough
Chenoweth	Inglis	Schaefer
Chrysler	Istook	Schiff
Clinger	Johnson (CT)	Seastrand
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Coburn	Jones	Shaw
Collins (GA)	Kasich	Skeen
Combest	Kelly	Smith (MI)
Cooley	Kim	Smith (NJ)
Cox	King	Smith (TX)
Crane	Kingston	Smith (WA)
Crapo	Knollenberg	Solomon
Creameans	Kolbe	Souder
Cubin	LaHood	Spence
Cunningham	Largent	Stearns
Davis	Latham	Stockman
Deal	LaTourette	Stump
DeLay	Laughlin	Talent
Diaz-Balart	Lazio	Tate
Doolittle	Leach	Tauzin
Dornan	Lewis (KY)	Taylor (NC)
Dreier	Lightfoot	Thomas
Duncan	Linder	Thornberry
Dunn	Livingston	Tiahrt
Ehlers	LoBiondo	Torkildsen
Ehrlich	Longley	Upton
Emerson	Lucas	Vucanovich
English	Manzullo	Waldholtz
Ensign	Martini	Walker
Everett	McCollum	Walsh
Ewing	McCrery	Wamp
Fawell	McDade	Watts (OK)
Fields (TX)	McInnis	Weldon (FL)
Flanagan	McIntosh	Weller
Foley	McKeon	White
Fox	Metcalf	Whitfield
Franks (CT)	Meyers	Wicker
Franks (NJ)	Mica	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	Young (AK)
Frist	Molinar	Zeliff
	Moorhead	Zimmer

NAYS—185

Abercrombie	Bonior	Clayton
Ackerman	Borski	Clement
Allard	Browder	Clyburn
Andrews	Brown (CA)	Coleman
Baessler	Brown (FL)	Collins (IL)
Baldacci	Brown (OH)	Collins (MI)
Barcia	Bryant (TX)	Condit
Barrett (WI)	Bunn	Conyers
Becerra	Burr	Costello
Beilenson	Cardin	Coyne
Bentsen	Chapman	Cramer
Bevill	Christensen	Danner
Bishop	Clay	de la Garza

DeFazio	Kennelly	Rahall
DeLauro	Kildee	Rangel
Dellums	Kleczka	Reed
Deutsch	Klink	Richardson
Dixon	Lantos	Rivers
Doggett	Levin	Roemer
Dooley	Lewis (GA)	Rose
Doyle	Lincoln	Roybal-Allard
Durbin	Lipinski	Rush
Edwards	Lofgren	Sabo
Engel	Lowey	Sanders
Eshoo	Luther	Sawyer
Evans	Maloney	Schroeder
Farr	Manton	Schumer
Fattah	Markey	Scott
Fazio	Mascara	Serrano
Filner	Matsui	Shadegg
Flake	McCarthy	Shays
Foglietta	McDermott	Sisisky
Forbes	McHale	Skaggs
Ford	McKinney	Skelton
Frank (MA)	McNulty	Slaughter
Frost	Meehan	Stark
Furse	Meek	Stenholm
Gejdenson	Menendez	Stokes
Gephardt	Mfume	Stupak
Geren	Miller (CA)	Tanner
Gibbons	Minge	Taylor (MS)
Gonzalez	Mink	Tejeda
Gordon	Moakley	Thompson
Green	Mollohan	Thurman
Gutierrez	Montgomery	Torres
Hall (OH)	Moran	Towns
Hamilton	Murtha	Trafficant
Harman	Nadler	Velazquez
Hastings (FL)	Neal	Vento
Hefner	Oberstar	Visclosky
Hilliard	Obey	Volkmmer
Hinchey	Oliver	Ward
Holden	Ortiz	Waters
Hoyer	Orton	Watt (NC)
Jackson-Lee	Pallone	Williams
Jacobs	Pastor	Wilson
Jefferson	Payne (NJ)	Wise
Johnson (SD)	Payne (VA)	Woolsey
Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi	Wyden
Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)	Wynn
Kennedy (MA)	Pomeroy	Yates
Kennedy (RI)	Poshard	

NOT VOTING—28

Berman	Klug	Spratt
Boucher	LaFalce	Studds
Buyer	Lewis (CA)	Thornton
Dickey	Martinez	Torricelli
Dicks	McHugh	Tucker
Dingell	Owens	Waxman
Fields (LA)	Peterson (FL)	Weldon (PA)
Goodling	Pickett	Young (FL)
Johnston	Quillen	
Kaptur	Shuster	

□ 1349

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Young of Florida for, with Mr. Waxman against.

Mr. Quillen for, with Ms. Kaptur against.

Mr. Lewis of California for, with Mr. Johnston of Florida against.

Mr. GILMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO DISPOSE OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 115, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 261, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 115), making further continuing appropri-

tions for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and I offer a motion.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). Pursuant to House Resolution 261, the Senate amendments are considered as read.

The text of the Senate amendments is as follows:

Senate amendments:

Page 2, line 20, after "1948," insert: section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236),

Page 10, line 19, after "resolution," insert: Included in the apportionment for the Federal Payment to the District of Columbia shall be an additional \$15,000,000 above the amount otherwise made available by this joint resolution, for purposes of certain capital construction loan repayments pursuant to Public Law 85-451, as amended.

Page 15, strike out line 1 and all that follows over to and including line 7 on page 36, and insert:

TITLE III

PROHIBITION ON SUBSIDIZING POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS WITH TAXPAYER FUNDS

SEC. 301. (a) LIMITATIONS.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any organization receiving Federal grants in an amount that, in the aggregate, is greater than \$125,000 in the most recent Federal fiscal year, shall be subject to the limitations on lobbying activity expenditures under section 4911(c)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, except that, if exempt purpose expenditures are over \$17,000,000 then the organization shall also be subject to a limitation on lobbying of 1 percent of the excess of the exempt purpose expenditures over \$17,000,000 unless otherwise subject to section 4911(c)(2)(A) based on an election made under section 501(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) An organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that engaged in lobbying activities during the organization's previous taxable year shall not be eligible to receive Federal funds constituting a taxpayer subsidized grant. This paragraph shall not apply to organizations described in section 501(c)(4) with gross annual revenues of less than \$3,000,000 in such previous taxable year, including Federal funds received as a taxpayer subsidized grant.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this title:

(1) AGENCY.—The term "agency" has the meaning given that term in section 551(1) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) CLIENT.—The term "client" means any person or entity that employs or retains another person for financial or other compensation to conduct lobbying activities on behalf of that person or entity. A person or entity whose employees act as lobbyists on its own behalf is both a client and an employer of such employees. In the case of a coalition or association that employs or retains other persons to conduct lobbying activities, the client is the coalition or association and not its individual members.

(3) COVERED EXECUTIVE BRANCH OFFICIAL.—The term "covered executive branch official" means—

(A) the President;

(B) the Vice President;

(C) any officer or employee, or any other individual functioning in the capacity of such an officer or employee, in the Executive Office of the President;

(D) any officer or employee serving in a position in level I, II, III, IV, or V of the Executive

Schedule, as designated by statute or Executive order;

(E) any member of the uniformed services whose pay grade is at or above O-7 under section 201 of title 37, United States Code; and

(F) any officer or employee serving in a position of a confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character described in section 7511(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code.

(4) COVERED LEGISLATIVE BRANCH OFFICIAL.—The term "covered legislative branch official" means—

(A) a Member of Congress;

(B) an elected officer of either House of Congress;

(C) any employee of, or any other individual functioning in the capacity of an employee of—

(i) a Member of Congress;

(ii) a committee of either House of Congress;

(iii) the leadership staff of the House of Representatives or the leadership staff of the Senate;

(iv) a joint committee of Congress; and

(v) a working group or caucus organized to provide legislative services or other assistance to Members of Congress; and

(D) any other legislative branch employee serving in a position described under section 109(13) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

(5) EMPLOYEE.—The term "employee" means any individual who is an officer, employee, partner, director, or proprietor of a person or entity, but does not include—

(A) independent contractors; or

(B) volunteers who receive no financial or other compensation from the person or entity for their services.

(6) FOREIGN ENTITY.—The term "foreign entity" means a foreign principal (as defined in section 1(b) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611(b))).

(7) GRANT.—The term "grant" means the provision of any Federal funds, appropriated under this or any other Act, to carry out a public purpose of the United States, except—

(A) the provision of funds for acquisition (by purchase, lease, or barter) of property or services for the direct benefit or use of the United States;

(B) the payments of loans, debts, or entitlements;

(C) the provision of funds to, or distribution of funds by, a Federal court established under Article I or III of the Constitution of the United States;

(D) nonmonetary assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to organizations approved or recognized under section 5902 of title 38, United States Code; and

(E) the provision of grant and scholarship funds to students for educational purposes.

(8) LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—The term "lobbying activities" means lobbying contacts and efforts in support of such contacts, including preparation and planning activities, research and other background work that is intended, at the time it is performed, for use in contacts, and coordination with the lobbying activities of others.

(9) LOBBYING CONTACT.—

(A) DEFINITION.—The term "lobbying contact" means any oral or written communication (including an electronic communication) to a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official that is made on behalf of a client with regard to—

(i) the formulation, modification, or adoption of Federal legislation (including legislative proposals);

(ii) the formulation, modification, or adoption of a Federal rule, regulation, Executive order, or any other program, policy, or position of the United States Government;

(iii) the administration or execution of a Federal program or policy (including the negotiation, award, or administration of a Federal contract, grant, loan, permit, or license); or

(iv) the nomination or confirmation of a person for a position subject to confirmation by the Senate.

(B) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The term "lobbying contact" does not include a communication that is—

(i) made by a public official acting in the public official's official capacity;

(ii) made by a representative of a media organization if the purpose of the communication is gathering and disseminating news and information to the public;

(iii) made in a speech, article, publication or other material that is distributed and made available to the public, or through radio, television, cable television, or other medium of mass communication;

(iv) made on behalf of a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party and disclosed under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.);

(v) a request for a meeting, a request for the status of an action, or any other similar administrative request, if the request does not include an attempt to influence a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official;

(vi) made in the course of participation in an advisory committee subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act;

(vii) testimony given before a committee, subcommittee, or task force of the Congress, or submitted for inclusion in the public record of a hearing conducted by such committee, subcommittee, or task force;

(viii) information provided in writing in response to an oral or written request by a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official for specific information;

(ix) required by subpoena, civil investigative demand, or otherwise compelled by statute, regulation, or other action of the Congress or an agency;

(x) made in response to a notice in the Federal Register, Commerce Business Daily, or other similar publication soliciting communications from the public and directed to the agency official specifically designated in the notice to receive such communications;

(xi) not possible to report without disclosing information, the unauthorized disclosure of which is prohibited by law;

(xii) made to an official in an agency with regard to—

(i) a judicial proceeding or a criminal or civil law enforcement inquiry, investigation, or proceeding; or

(ii) a filing or proceeding that the Government is specifically required by statute or regulation to maintain or conduct on a confidential basis,

if that agency is charged with responsibility for such proceeding, inquiry, investigation, or filing;

(xiii) made in compliance with written agency procedures regarding an adjudication conducted by the agency under section 554 of title 5, United States Code, or substantially similar provisions;

(xiv) a written comment filed in the course of a public proceeding or any other communication that is made on the record in a public proceeding;

(xv) a petition for agency action made in writing and required to be a matter of public record pursuant to established agency procedures;

(xvi) made on behalf of an individual with regard to that individual's benefits, employment, or other personal matters involving only that individual, except that this clause does not apply to any communication with—

(I) a covered executive branch official, or

(II) a covered legislative branch official (other than the individual's elected Members of Congress or employees who work under such Members' direct supervision),

with respect to the formulation, modification, or adoption of private legislation for the relief of that individual;

(xvii) a disclosure by an individual that is protected under the amendments made by the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989, under the Inspector General Act of 1978, or under another provision of law;

(xviii) made by—

(I) a church, its integrated auxiliary, or a convention or association of churches that is exempt from filing a Federal income tax return under paragraph 2(A)(i) of section 6033(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or

(II) a religious order that is exempt from filing a Federal income tax return under paragraph 2(A)(iii) of such section 6033(a); and

(xix) between—

(I) officials of a self-regulatory organization (as defined in section 3(a)(26) of the Securities Exchange Act) that is registered with or established by the Securities and Exchange Commission as required by that Act or a similar organization that is designated by or registered with the Commodities Future Trading Commission as provided under the Commodity Exchange Act; and

(II) the Securities and Exchange Commission or the Commodities Future Trading Commission, respectively;

relating to the regulatory responsibilities of such organization under that Act.

(10) **LOBBYING FIRM.**—The term "lobbying firm" means a person or entity that has 1 or more employees who are lobbyists on behalf of a client other than that person or entity. The term also includes a self-employed individual who is a lobbyist.

(11) **LOBBYIST.**—The term "lobbyist" means any individual who is employed or retained by a client for financial or other compensation for services that include more than one lobbying contact, other than an individual whose lobbying activities constitute less than 20 percent of the time engaged in the services provided by such individual to that client over a six month period.

(12) **MEDIA ORGANIZATION.**—The term "media organization" means a person or entity engaged in disseminating information to the general public through a newspaper, magazine, other publication, radio, television, cable television, or other medium of mass communication.

(13) **MEMBER OF CONGRESS.**—The term "Member of Congress" means a Senator or a Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress.

(14) **ORGANIZATION.**—The term "organization" means a person or entity other than an individual.

(15) **PERSON OR ENTITY.**—The term "person or entity" means any individual, corporation, company, foundation, association, labor organization, firm, partnership, society, joint stock company, group of organizations, or State or local government.

(16) **PUBLIC OFFICIAL.**—The term "public official" means any elected official, appointed official, or employee of—

(A) a Federal, State, or local unit of government in the United States other than—

(i) a college or university;

(ii) a government-sponsored enterprise (as defined in section 3(8) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974);

(iii) a public utility that provides gas, electricity, water, or communications;

(iv) a guaranty agency (as defined in section 435(j) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20

U.S.C. 1085(j))), including any affiliate of such an agency; or

(v) an agency of any State functioning as a student loan secondary market pursuant to section 435(d)(1)(F) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1085(d)(1)(F));

(B) a Government corporation (as defined in section 9101 of title 31, United States Code);

(C) an organization of State or local elected or appointed officials other than officials of an entity described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), or (v) of subparagraph (A);

(D) an Indian tribe (as defined in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e)));

(E) a national or State political party or any organizational unit thereof; or

(F) a national, regional, or local unit of any foreign government.

(17) **STATE.**—The term "State" means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and any commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 302. (a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31 of each year, each taxpayer subsidized grantee, except an individual person, shall provide (via either electronic or paper medium) to each Federal entity that awarded or administered its taxpayer subsidized grant an annual report for the previous Federal fiscal year, certified by the taxpayer subsidized grantee's chief executive officer or equivalent person of authority, setting forth—

(1) the taxpayer subsidized grantee's name and grantee identification number;

(2) a statement that the taxpayer subsidized grantee agrees that it is, and shall continue to be, contractually bound by the terms of this title as a condition of the continued receipt and use of Federal funds; and

(3)(A) a statement that the taxpayer subsidized grantee spent less than \$25,000 on lobbying activities in the grantee's most recent taxable year; or

(B)(i) the amount or value of the taxpayer subsidized grant (including all administrative and overhead costs awarded);

(ii) a good faith estimate of the grantee's actual expenses on lobbying activities in the most recent taxable year; and

(iii) a good faith estimate of the grantee's allowed expenses on lobbying activities under section 301 of this Act.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. 303. (a) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF LOBBYING DISCLOSURE FORMS.—Any Federal entity awarding a taxpayer subsidized grant shall make publicly available any taxpayer subsidized grant application, and the annual report of a taxpayer subsidized grantee provided under section 302 of this Act.

(b) **ACCESSIBILITY TO PUBLIC.**—The public's access to the documents identified in subsection (a) shall be facilitated by placement of such documents in the Federal entity's public document reading room and also by expediting any requests under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, the Freedom of Information Act as amended, ahead of any requests for other information pending at such Federal entity.

(c) **WITHHOLDING PROHIBITED.**—Records described in subsection (a) shall not be subject to withholding, except under the exemption set forth in subsection (b)(7)(A) of section 552 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) **FEES PROHIBITED.**—No fees for searching for or copying such documents shall be charged to the public.

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this title shall become effective January 4, 1996.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. LIVINGSTON moves:

- (1) That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 1.
- (2) That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 2.
- (3) That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 with an amendment as follows:

Delete the matter proposed by said amendment, and beginning on page 15, line 1 of the House engrossed joint resolution, H.J. Res. 115, strike all down to and including line 7, on page 36, and redesignate Title IV as Title III, and renumber sections accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 261, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and that I be permitted to include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, last night, the Senate amended House Joint Resolution 115, the second continuing resolution. The amendments: insert language included in the first CR to permit spending by the USIA in the absence of an authorization; insert a provision that would increase the amount made available to the District of Columbia by \$15 million so that it could make guaranteed loan payments to the Treasury; and modify the Simpson-Istook-McIntosh political advocacy language.

Mr. Speaker, I am offering a motion to dispose of these amendments. The first two are not controversial and make improvements to the CR and my motion is to concur with these amendments, for they are fine. The modification to the Simpson-Istook-McIntosh language unfortunately is technically insufficient and therefore, is not acceptable. There is agreement that we can not get an acceptable version on this matter agreed to on this CR. Therefore, my motion is to delete the Senate proposed modification and to delete the underlying Simpson-Istook-McIntosh language, so that it hopefully will be addressed at another time.

We need to keep the Government operating. The current CR expires on midnight, Monday, November 13. Disposing of the Senate amendments to this CR will kick it back to the Senate for their action when they return on Monday afternoon. This is the proper

course for us to take at this time. I urge all of my colleagues to support my motion.

I urge all of my friends on both sides of the aisle to be brief.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the primary job of the Congress, when it comes to appropriation bills, is simply to make all of its financial decisions and get all 13 appropriation bills finished by the end of the fiscal year. This year that did not happen, for one very clear reason. It has nothing whatsoever to do with any fault of the gentleman from Louisiana, the distinguished chairman of the committee. He has done a fine job.

The reason we are late is because the first 100 days of the session were devoted to passing what was known as the Contract With America, which the Congress and the country were told had been developed through extensive polling to determine exactly what the public wanted. And we were told by, among other people, the Speaker's pollster, that each and every proposal in the contract had been thoroughly tested.

Now, in fact, today's newspapers carry the confession from the Speaker's pollster that in fact those ideas were not tested with the American public, that the only thing that was tested were the advertising slogans associated with the sales job on that contract. So we spent 100 days in the beginning of the session working on legislation which was produced without the extensive documentation that we were told had taken place with respect to public opinion.

Because of that fact, the Congress did not have time to finish its appropriation bills. This chart demonstrates where we are at this point. This chart, which looks like a number of horses on a race track, shows that there are only 2 of the 13 appropriation bills which have passed the finish line, the military construction bill and the agriculture bill, and they both have been signed by the President. The third bill which has passed the congressional finish line, energy and water, has been finished by the Congress and I expect it will soon be signed by the President.

That means that there are 10 of the remaining appropriation bills which have still not gone through both houses of Congress, been conferenced out and sent to the President. That means that those 10 bills are literally stuck in the mud, and at this point they constitute 88 percent of the appropriated portion of the budget for the coming fiscal year.

So 88 percent of the Congress's work is not yet done, and yet today, because of that fact, we are told that we should pass a continuing resolution which "puts more pressure on the President,"

rather than simply passing a straight, clean continuing resolution to give the Congress more time to do its own work.

I find it quaint that we are being asked to ratchet up the pressure on the President because he has not signed bills that have not yet been sent to him. I really find that logic very difficult to follow.

□ 1400

Instead of sending a simple, clean CR to the President, which he has already indicated he would sign and which we have tried twice already today to get on this floor to pass, instead we are told we have to add two totally unrelated legislative riders. The first is that we are told we have to raise Medicare part B premiums by \$13, from basic law; and, second, until a few minutes ago, we were told that we needed to also add the Istook amendment, which put a gag on virtually every major charity in this country.

Now we are being told that the motion that the gentleman is going to be making will drop the Istook amendment. I thank you for small favors. That amendment has hung up the appropriation process for 53 legislative days. It does not belong on any appropriation bill whatsoever. I am happy that, belatedly, the majority party recognizes that fact.

But I would say also that neither does an unrelated rider belong on this bill which will force the Congress to ratify the decision of the majority party to raise the Medicare part B premium. In fact, they not only want to raise it, they want to raise it by \$2 more per month than they did just 2 weeks ago in their basic budget.

Now, we have heard today that they are doing that to save Medicare. Well, again, we remember what Mr. GINGRICH and Mr. DOLE said just 2 weeks ago behind closed doors when Mr. DOLE said on October 24, "I was there fighting the fight, voting against Medicare, 1 of the 12, because we knew it would not work in 1995."

Then we had the Speaker talking to Blue Cross-Blue Shield, and he was discussing Medicare and saying:

We don't get rid of it in round one, because we don't think that is politically smart and we don't think that is the right way to go through a transition period. But we believe it is going to wither on the vine, because we think people are voluntarily going to leave it.

That does not sound like a crew interested in compromise. It certainly does not sound to me like a crew interested in saving Medicare. They cannot resist coming to the floor at every opportunity and trying to push up the cost of Medicare to seniors and to squeeze at the same time what the Federal Government will pay to meet Medicare costs.

I would simply urge the majority party to do what every person in this

room knows ought to happen, to drop the ideological zeal, to drop the hunger for creating additional divisions.

Our main duty today is not to have further partisan fights. Our main duty is to simply keep the Government going. You can do that by passing a clean CR without trying to hold Medicare hostage to a Presidential signature on the continuing resolution.

I urge a vote no on the Livingston motion.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, would have us believe that this resolution is unusual in some way. Well, he knows that while the Democrats were in control of the House of Representatives for 40 uninterrupted years, going back as far back as 1977, which is the last date I have figures for, we had 1 continuing resolution for 1 bill; again, in 1978, another bill; in 1979, for 3 bills; in 1980, 4 bills; in 1981, 4 bills; in 1982, 6 bills; 1983, 3 bills; 1984, 8 bills; 1985, 7 bills; and then 1986 and 1987, they were still in control, 13 bills each.

Continuing resolutions were a way of life under the Democrat-controlled House of Representatives. Frankly, I tend to agree with the gentleman. I would just as soon not have continuing resolutions.

I am sorry we did not get the business done, but we did go through the Contract With America for 4 months. This Congress, by David Broder's admission and the admission of most of the other commentators who follow Capitol Hill, has been one of the most productive Congresses in the history of modern times in America. We have been busy. We have worked hard. Everybody knows about the hours we are putting in. The appropriation bills have not been completed, and that is not unusual.

The fact is, we have totally completed three bills. The President has signed two, and he has sent back one, and I still, 6 weeks later, have yet to understand why he did not sign that bill, the legislative branch bill.

We have three others ready for him right now. They are just on their way. In fact, one is on the way. Energy and water is before him as well. These bills are working their way through. In another 2 weeks, we will have virtually all of them to him.

Now, this is a regular, routine, traditional process. Yes, we are scaling back on the continuing resolution funding rate this time, our second one, because we want to make it less attractive, not only for the President but for the Congress, to operate on a continuing resolution. It is more important that we go ahead and pass the appropriation bills and that they become the law of the land and that we not fund government under continuing resolutions. So we do not want to make a continuing resolu-

tion more attractive than the alternative, thirteen regular bills through the traditional legislative process.

But we are asking for 2 additional weeks, 2 additional weeks, from November 13 through December 1. That is not outrageous, and it is not outrageous to ask the President to sign 2 additional weeks. But he is making a grandstand effort, using intemperate language. I think Leon Panetta said, "We are holding a gun to his head, threatening to blow him up, blow up government, if nothing happens." That is intemperate.

The point is, all the language, all of the rhetoric, all of the extreme talk that we have been hearing over the last few days, is just that. It means nothing. We are going to pass this continuing resolution today.

We have dropped the Simpson-Istook-McIntosh language, because, unfortunately, what the Senate did last night turned out to be technically less than perfect. It was not their fault. It was just a drafting problem that left us in a quandary. So we will address that issue at another date.

That was an objection of the President's. We are taking that objection out. There is no reason for him not to sign this bill. It is a perfectly good bill.

When it leaves here, it will go to the Senate, and they will just simply agree to what we did, and then he will have it on his desk on time, by November 13, and then he can sign it.

By the way, that is my 30th wedding anniversary. I remember that day.

I think that what we are doing is not properly represented by all the hue and cry and extreme rhetoric we have heard. This bill should be passed. Let us vote on it. Let us go home and go home quickly so people can catch their planes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, let me simply say, the gentleman can talk about deep, ancient history as often as he wants. The fact is that last year, when I chaired the Committee on Appropriations, every single one of these appropriation bills was passed on time before the end of the fiscal year. The reason that happened is because I went to the ranking Republican and we worked out a bipartisan approach to each and every one of those 13 bills.

That is what the gentleman from Louisiana's leadership should have allowed him to do. If they had, we would not be here today with the need for this resolution, and we would not be facing an extraneous debate on Medicare just because your party has a compulsion to raise Medicare fees every time they hit the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is a big lie that Dachau never happened, and yet I hear people say it never happened in Germany. And here I heard that a balanced budget and the items in the contract and right here in appropriations were not tested.

Well, it was not only tested across America, you ask any American if the balanced budget and line-item veto and Congress acting like everybody else is not tested. And then there was even a greater test right here on the House floor, Mr. Speaker. It received 315 votes, and failed in the Senate only by 1 vote, and we had two of the California Senators from the other body that voted against it, after they pledged in their campaign that they would vote for it; and, yes it was defeated in the Senate. So we place it on a bill, because we think that Americans want a balanced budget amendment. The President claims he wants a balanced budget amendment, and yet he will not sign it.

The gentleman says, "Look, we passed all of the appropriations bills when we were in power last year." They had the House, they had the Senate, they had the Presidency. And let us look what those bills were. They increased the marginal tax rate on the middle class after they promised they were going to decrease the tax on the middle class. They cut the COLA of the military. They increased the Social Security tax on our chronologically gifted folks. They cut defense \$177 billion, after saying \$50 billion would put us into a hollow force. So, yes, they passed it. And the liberals left agenda of this House, when they had all bodies, is the exact reason why we have more Democrats changing over to Republicans since the Whig Party.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully to the gentleman from Louisiana, and I have not heard him mention the word "Medicare" in any of his remarks. I would yield to the gentleman for a question: Does the gentleman's amendment delete the provision in the continuing resolution which increases the Medicare premiums by 25 percent?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman knows this amendment has passed as part of this continuing resolution, gone to the Senate and passed, and it has a majority of the votes. It is simply an attempt to keep the Medicare program on track so it will be there for our children and grandchildren, and so that people who need assistance can get the assistance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think the answer is no. I think after you listen carefully, what the gentleman came to conclude was no.

What it means is there are two objectionable provisions in this bill. One is this rather strange Istook provision which keeps wandering back and forth. Finally they had the good sense to take that out. But they have left in the provision that is a real problem.

The Republicans, in order to continue the business of the Federal Government, to keep the lights on, insist, insist, that the President must sign a bill to increase Medicare premiums on seniors by 25 percent. He is not going to sign that bill.

This is an issue like Banquo's ghost wandering through, rattling through the Halls of the Capitol. Speaker GINGRICH is determined to raise Medicare premiums, at any cost. He will shut down the Federal Government so that he can raise Medicare premiums.

The President has told him this is irresponsible. For many seniors, it will put an economic burden on them which they cannot shoulder. We have to make sure that Medicare is strong, but we cannot hit the most vulnerable seniors in our society by an increase in premiums.

My friend from Louisiana has spoken long and eloquently about everything in this bill, and never mentioned the word "Medicare." The reason, he cannot stand it. He cannot stand to bring this issue up, because he knows that three out of four of the American people believe Speaker GINGRICH and the Republicans have gone too far, cutting Medicare to balance the budget, cutting Medicare to provide tax cuts for wealthy people.

There is an old poem that went something like this: As I was going up the stair, I met a man who wasn't there; he wasn't there again today, I wish that man would go away.

The man we are talking about here is Medicare. The Republicans do not want you to know it is in this bill, but it is right here on page 52, an increase in premiums, that will result in a veto by President Clinton, a veto for the American people, for the seniors in this country, an embarrassment to the Republicans that they will not even discuss on the floor of this House of Representatives.

It is a sad commentary that next Tuesday we will be shutting down Federal agencies. Many people who will call these agencies to sign up for veterans benefits, for Social Security benefits, will find that nobody answers the phone. Some folks who are waiting at home to get their checks, whether it is from the Veterans Administration or college student loans, will wonder what happened to the checks. The checks will not be coming. The phones will not be answered, because the Republican strategy is to shut down the Government to raise Medicare premiums.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad commentary. Shame on you. I am going to read how many times we had continuing resolutions under the Democrat's control just since 1977. I am also going to read how many times they shut the Government down during Bush and Reagan Presidencies, because of their tactics. And here they come down on the House floor and shed these crocodile tears, how upset they are we are going to shut the Government down, and how we are forcing the Democrat Party to accept something against their will.

Listen carefully, my colleagues. Since 1980 the Government has found itself with a funding gap nine different times.

Nine different times the other side controlled Congress, so all of my colleagues coming down here with their crocodile tears does not hold water. Nine times the Democratic-run Congress shut down the Government.

□ 1415

In 1990, and guess who was chief, guess who was head of the Committee on the Budget at that time? Mr. Leon Panetta.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEARNS. I will not yield to the gentleman from Maryland, at this time, I regret.

When President Clinton's own Chief of Staff, Mr. Panetta, was the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget we shut the Government down, the Congress did, and Mr. Panetta was leading the charge. This is the same Mr. Panetta who now calls shutting down the Government this way a blackmail. Crocodile tears. Come on.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this must be the pot calling the kettle black because Mr. Panetta was involved intimately with this business until the wee hours. We all remember, that we were here, until Christmas.

In 1987, the Democrats shut the Congress down. In 1986 and 1984, once for 2 days and again 1 more day. In 1983, shut it down again. In 1982, twice more. Both times for 4 days. And then in 1981 they shut it down. How can they come down to the House floor and shed all these tears and talk about how this is terrible when they shut it down themselves nine times?

Since 1977 the Democratic-run Congress has passed 55 continuing resolutions instead of a complete budget.

Now, I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], bless his soul, 55 times we have had continuing resolutions yet we have all these charts and all this rhetoric talking about, oh, gee, we cannot have these continuing resolutions. But we have had 55 of these since 1977. Now their leaders claim such a resolution is a major problem.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman asked me a question.

Mr. STEARNS. It was a rhetorical question.

Mr. OBEY. It certainly was.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, where were they when they passed 55 of these continuing resolutions?

Mr. Speaker, we have before us legislation that would end the history, the 40-year history, of Democratic continuing resolutions, debt ceiling increases and, for once, set us on the right course toward a balanced budget. When those in opposition to this bill call this a crisis that we have caused, when those over there that are starting to stand say there is a crisis here in the House that we, the Republicans, have caused, I urge them to look at the record, look at their own mistakes, and say to them that Republicans have learned to do better.

Mr. Speaker, we do not intend to duplicate their failures. My colleagues on this side and that side of the aisle, let us start fresh and new and pass this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman wants to talk about history as if Ronald Reagan and George Bush had not participated in it. The fact of the matter is the gentleman from Kansas, BOB DOLE, tries to pretend it is going to be the President who shuts down Government, but, apparently, for the last 40 years it was the Congress that shut down Government when Ronald Reagan or George Bush vetoed those CR's.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I don't recall that the gentleman yielded to me. If I could have recalled that, perhaps I would.

The fact of the matter is, ladies and gentlemen, we know what we should do responsibly. We know that we ought not to, in this bill, for the next 12 days, have to attack senior citizens and their Medicare and put them additionally at risk. That does not happen until January 1. There is no panic on that. Why is this Medicare proposal in here to increase the premium on seniors? It is not necessary.

This does put at risk, as all of us know, because the President has said very clearly, I will not sign this bill. Therefore, we have a decision to make. Do we pass a continuing resolution which substitutes for our ability to do our job? Not the President, but our ability.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] said, last year all the bills passed in a timely fashion and were signed by the President. The fact of the matter is that we have not done our

job and, therefore, what we should do, responsibly, is not look back and blame and point fingers. We should do the responsible thing today, and the responsible thing to do today is to say if we have not done our job, then we will provide for the next 2 weeks or 4 weeks for the ongoing operations of Government, which everybody intends to happen, without placing at risk Federal employees, but, more important, without placing at risk all Americans who rely on the jobs they do day to day.

Ladies and gentlemen of this House, let us not go through the charade of striking Istook and sending it to the Senate, then going to the President and having him veto it and come back here. Let us do our job first and do it responsibly.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman kindly. The Republican majority does not want to shut down the Federal Government. I think that has been clearly stated. However, we are absolutely committed to placing our financial house in order. We had 25 years without balancing a budget. We have heard that before, but it is about time we started on the road to accomplishing that fact.

Balancing the budget is no small task, Mr. Speaker. If it was easy, it would have been done a long time ago. So it does take some diligence, some dedication, and some perseverance to cut Government spending.

Some in this body believe the majority here on the Republican side should just simply give in to President Clinton and continue the policies of spend now and worry later. I think most of us disagree. Certainly I disagree very strongly. We have to hold steadfast to our commitment to reduce discretionary spending and eliminate the deficit.

The gentleman from Louisiana, Chairman LIVINGSTON, recalled that over the years the CR is nothing new. This is not a new gimmick, a new gag, something we are trying to pull on our colleagues. In fact, for 2 years in a row there were 13 bills. That is the total number of bills in the appropriations lineup. So, Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority is acting responsibly.

I heard the gentleman previous to me speak about not doing our job. Well, I tell my colleagues that we have done our job. The Constitution says we pass the bills and the President has to sign them. Now, the President will have an opportunity on Monday to do just that. It is his decision, it is his choice, and if President Clinton decides to veto the CR, a Federal Government shutdown will occur but it will be because, and only because he decided to place politics above the interests of the Amer-

ican people and the future of America's children.

I say this is a proper CR. I say we pass it. I urge support.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker needs to understand, we have not passed our bills. The President cannot sign appropriations bills we have not yet sent him, and 10 out of the 13 appropriation bills have not escaped the clutches of this Congress.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, no, I will not. I do not have the time.

For the gentleman to suggest that it is the President to blame for the Government not functioning, when the Congress has failed to pass 88 percent of its appropriated items is, to me, baffling logic.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we celebrate Veterans Day. Tomorrow we honor the service of our Nation's veterans to this country, but sadly, today, we are doing a grave disservice to those very same veterans. Instead of honoring our veterans with a 21-gun salute, as we should, the Republican leadership today is launching a three-pronged attack against our veterans.

First, this continuing resolution, which we will vote on in just a few moments, locks in a \$500 million decrease in VA health care below the President's request, a level for veterans health care even lower than that passed through cuts in the House budget. That is wrong and it is unfair. If anyone thinks that today's veterans are getting better health care than they deserve, then I encourage them to vote for this continuing resolution.

The second attack today on our Nation's veterans is that we are increasing Medicare part B premiums for World War II veterans. What an odd way to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the end of that war.

The third attack of the Republican leadership on our veterans is that they want us to have a weekend recess while the U.S. Government is on the verge of being shut down Monday at midnight. Let me make that clear. We are on the verge of shutting down many services provided in terms of health care to our Nation's veterans. We are on the verge of shutting down VA regional offices that provide pensions and care for our veterans, many of whom are service-connected disabled. And while we are on the verge of shutting down that important service and services to our veterans, the Republican leadership wants us to take a recess this weekend. They want us to go home and make speeches.

I have a message: the veterans are more interested in health care service than lip service. That is wrong.

Mr. LIVINGSTONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], a distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations, who will respond to those frivolous charges.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, many have asked what will happen to Federal employees. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] and the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] and I asked the CRS to give us a paper on what has happened in the past.

No Federal employee has ever lost a dollar. I want to read the text of a letter we received today from the Speaker and also the majority leader, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE]. It said:

We will be sending soon to President Clinton a bill to continue funding for the Federal Government through December 1, 1995. Besides providing for government services, this bill also funds Federal workers' salaries.

If the President decides to veto this vital legislation to keep government operating, the possibility exists that some Federal workers may be furloughed. In the event that this takes place, it is our commitment that Federal employees will not be punished as a direct result of the President's decision to veto funding for their salaries. Should this happen, we are committed to restoring any lost wages in a subsequent funding bill.

Again, we want to reassure you that if the President vetoes the continuing resolution and requires Federal workers to be furloughed, we are committing to restoring any lost wages retroactively.

That has been the way we have handled it in the past and that is the way we will handle it this time.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the letter referred to for the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, November 10, 1995.

Hon. FRANK WOLF,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR FRANK: We will be sending soon to President Clinton a bill to continue funding for the federal government through December 1, 1995. Besides providing for government services, this bill also funds federal workers' salaries.

If the President decides to veto this vital legislation to keep government operating, the possibility exists that some federal workers may be furloughed. In the event that this takes place, it is our commitment that federal employees will not be punished as a direct result of the President's decision to veto funding for their salaries. Should this happen, we are committed to restoring any lost wages in a subsequent funding bill.

Again, we want to reassure you that if the President vetoes the continuing resolution and requires federal workers to be furloughed, we are committed to restoring any lost wages retroactively.

Sincerely,

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House.
BOB DOLE,
Senate Majority Leader.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding, and I want to just say that I appreciate his efforts

and those of the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] in working with the Speaker and the majority leader from the other body to make sure that this guarantee to Federal workers is going to be honored at the appropriate time, as it has in the past.

I would note to my colleagues that the last time this happened, Federal workers were later paid, but it ended up costing the Federal Government \$200 million per day for every day that they were furloughed. So we are here talking about saving money, but in the long term, if an agreement is not worked out mutually between the White House and Congress, the taxpayers suffer. That is not right.

There is an old saying when the elephants fight, the grass gets trampled. We have 800,000 Federal employees in this case who are going to be not paid as a result of this. I think this letter will give them some guarantee down the road. I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are happy with this part of it as well.

□ 1430

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I remember opening day here. Do my colleagues remember those grand speeches about how well-run the House was going to be? We were going to have good management here; that our work was going to proceed on time with open rules, with efficiency.

What have we got? An abject failure for Congress to meet its responsibilities to do its work on time.

Mr. Speaker, now we could solve this problem really quite simply: A clean extension of the authority of this Government to keep functioning after Monday. But, instead, a scene out of Lawrence of Arabia. Take our prisoners in the determination to raise Medicare premiums, a determination to throw this Government into the street in order to make sure that some of America's most vulnerable citizens have got to pay more.

Thank goodness President Clinton has stood fast against this kind of moral and political bankruptcy and against this kind of mismanagement of the business of this country.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], chairman of the Committee on Science.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, for a number of days, we have heard people come to the floor and tell us if we would only take a mild, more bipartisan approach, we could, in fact, solve some of these problems. We have heard day after day that the Istook amendment was the problem on this bill; that if we could just remove the Istook amendment and take a bipartisan ap-

proach, that we could get these problems solved.

Mr. Speaker, guess what? We solved the Istook amendment, and the very same Members who were concerned about the Istook amendment now come to the floor with other things. The fact is that they come to the floor now, and they have new complaints. The fact is that some Members just are not willing to be bipartisan. They want the President to veto the bill under any circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, we gave the President one continuing resolution. It was clean. Did that bring the White House to the negotiating table? No, they did nothing. The Speaker spent 25 hours on the plane and the President did not even talk to him.

Mr. Speaker, the main complaint that we are hearing here today is the fact that they do not like a continuing resolution that is the lower of the funds of the two Houses. The White House has a complaint about that; our Democratic colleagues do.

We have had so many years of continuing resolutions around here. Continuing resolutions actually have traditions. This particular tradition is called the Michel formula. We worked it out on a bipartisan basis over the years. The lower of the two House funds. It is one of the great traditions, after 40 years of continuing resolutions out of Democrats. Now, they say they cannot take it. It is not something that ought to be included in this.

Mr. Speaker, I hear the sound, yea, I hear the distinct sound of hypocrisy fogging the minds in this Chamber, and we are not seeing the kind of bipartisanship, because they simply do not want to do what has been done in the past when they were in the majority.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, it is time, folks, to stop the gimmicks. It is time to stop the budget. Start now. It would be nice to do it in a bipartisan way, but bipartisanship is not the intention of the minority.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, the last speaker reminded me of an oft-quoted quote of the late Will Rogers when he said, "It ain't people's ignorance that bothers me so much; it is them knowing so much that ain't so that is the problem."

Medicare is not the issue today. The fundamental question is: Why is it in a continuing resolution? That is a simple question. It is not like we could not get a unanimous vote to have a clean CR sent to the President that he will sign. That can be done, guaranteed 100 percent.

The problem is we have spent 314 days not doing our work, as we have seen the chart time after time. Now, we are wasting 5 additional days in the

same way we have wasted a good part of the previous 314 days, sending something to the President that the President has already said he would veto.

Mr. Speaker, I ask simply: Why are we doing this? Why are we wasting a weekend? Why are we having to have our own staffs get ready to be furloughed? Why are we having the possibility of 800,000 of our Federal workers going on a furlough? For what reason? To send a message to the President?

Mr. Speaker, the best way to send a message to the President is to do our work so we have got something to negotiate. And to those that say that is not an issue, what about those of us in this body that would like to work with somebody on appropriations bills, on the continuing resolution? Why do we have to have bloodhounds out finding out where you are meeting? Why, when we call the chairman of our own committee, they do not know what is going on? Because the Speaker has not told them yet what it is we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is very clear. We can send a clean CR; we can spend this weekend working instead of speechmaking; we can get on with doing our work and we can quit being ugly to each other and the American people.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, first I want to regress just to address one thing on what we did a few minutes earlier in passing an increase in the debt ceiling.

Mr. Speaker, I did not get to mention it in my remarks, but basically, we heard they are dipping into these trust funds now; and the Secretary of Treasury says it does not matter what the Congress does; Even though they are in charge, we are going to steal from these funds no matter what.

But, in fact, if we ran in the private sector our retirement funds in the fashion that this Congress operates, we would basically go to jail. It cannot be done that way in the private sector. The only difference here is that we have an unlimited resource and that is taxpayers' wallets.

Mr. Speaker, let me talk about why we are in this situation, and we are in this situation. Until October 1, this Congress was running under the past Congress' financial plan. We do not like that plan. We do not think that the solution to the problems of this country and this Congress is throwing more money at problems.

Regarding education, for example, we spend billions of dollars and look at what we get. In my communities and in Florida, 50 percent of our students entering community college need remedial education. Is that success?

In the area of environmental protection, they say we want to do damage.

When we spent 85 percent of our money on attorneys' fees and studies in our Superfund, is that success?

Mr. Speaker, because of this process, because they had their way to run this place and misused it until October 1, now we want to send more direction. We want to send some guidance on not just throwing money at these problems, but doing it with some wisdom, with some direction, with some results, and with some economy and some efficiency.

Under current law, we cannot even drink the water in this community today. So, we are asking for changes, and we want to see them changed through this appropriations process.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, what is the regulation in the House with regard to use of charts on the House floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to observe that charts may be used when the person who is speaking has placed them up, but they are not to be used in the Chamber unless the person who is speaking has them up.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry, if charts are knowingly inaccurate, are they allowed to be used on the House floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Any Member may object to the use of a chart.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry, and then what would be the process of the House? What is the remedy available to the House if the House does have objections to a false or misleading chart on the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule XXX of the House, if objection is made, then the question on the use of the chart will be put. The question can be placed before the Members.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to clarify, if the chart that is involved is, in fact, a distortion of someone's remarks, so that it constitutes essentially a lie, is that chart then permitted to be used, unless the House ruled otherwise?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objection can be made by any Member to any chart that is used.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, and that objection does not have to have a basis?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Any Member may object to the use of any chart.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, very recently, I believe it was last week, an objection was made to the use of charts during the abortion debate, and ultimately those charts were permitted to be used on the floor as an issue of free speech. Is this the same issue?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A vote was taken, and a majority of the membership of the House made the decision that that chart in that instance could be used.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of free speech?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The vote was a procedure that was determined under rule XXX of the House.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, what is the situation when a chart is used and the quote is crushingly accurate, but a Member in the Chamber does not like it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule XXX, if it is crushingly accurate, any Member may still object.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, what is the ruling of the Chair with respect to quotes that are taken entirely out of context and which relate to an agency rather than a program?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not believe that that is a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, is there any rule of the House which precludes a Member from bringing to the floor in the form of a chart an exact quotation from the front page of a daily newspaper?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As we stated, under rule XXX any Member may object to the use of any chart.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, even if it is accurate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Any Member may object to the use of any chart and cause the question of its use to be determined by the House.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, if a Member objects to numbers or quotes or what have you, do they have the responsibility to offer the source of their evidence that they are untrue?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is a fascinating parliamentary inquiry. The Chair will state again that under rule XXX, any Member may object to the use of any chart.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I am so glad we have finally gotten to the crux of this debate.

Mr. Speaker, we have been in this Chamber and I have heard the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] three times ask unanimous consent to bring up a clean continuing resolution.

Well, that was denied. Now we know why, because the Speaker opened his mouth before engaging his brain and what we are trying to do today is we are now trying to jam it to the President. They want to jam it to the President. They are taking all of this stuff out, except the increase on Medicare premiums so that people can pay \$13 more per month, according to the Congressional Budget Office. Not me, but the Congressional Budget Office says it will be about \$13 a month more, and they want to send this little message to the seniors that they are trying to get the President to sign off on this.

Now, if this was not the issue, if what Speaker GINGRICH had revealed as their own strategy, their secret strategy, was not the issue, why do they not let the gentleman from Wisconsin just bring up the clean CR?

The main thing hanging in there is this little present for our seniors so they can pay the tax benefit, or the crown jewel as the Speaker calls it, for their rich friends.

□ 1445

All those people who make over \$500,000 a year. So the Speaker says they cannot get rid of it right away, it is not politically smart, but we are going to give it away in transition.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I have to point out that the gentlewoman's chart was not objected to, but she knows full well that the Speaker was talking about the demise of HCFA, not the Social Security program. It may be an accurate quote, but that is the kind of distortion that this argument has gone off on. We are talking about a 14-day continuing resolution and we get all these extraneous arguments that have no relationship to the resolution. That is a totally fabricated argument.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] to show a real quote that is relevant.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, this is really what this debate is all about. Clinton said he knew that a lot of people in the room were "still mad about the 1993 budget and they think I raised their taxes too much. It might surprise you to know that I think I raised them too much, too."

That was President Clinton that said that. Maybe that is a misquote, but I think he said that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). The Chair will observe that no objection was made on the use of either chart.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST].

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I recall seeing on videotape this exact quote from the Senate majority leader, speaking on Medicare to the American Conservative Union:

I was there, fighting the fight, voting against Medicare, I out of 12, because we knew it would not work in 1965.

That is an exact quote from the Senate majority leader, Mr. DOLE.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FROST. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman think that might have been what he meant to say, or was he taken out of context?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, if I could, I would yield myself a lot more time to read the chart that describes the Democrat, President Clinton plan to save Medicare. But there is none so it does not take any time to describe it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, a continuing resolution, as my colleague from Texas said, should be a stopgap spending measure. It should not be an opportunity for extremists within the Republican Party to raise the Medicare premiums. That is what has been done here.

This bill raises the Medicare premium. Late last Tuesday night, Republicans voted to raise the Medicare premium from 24 percent to 31.5 percent. That means instead of the \$42 that the seniors were going to have to pay, they are now going to pay \$53 a month. And that is going to start on New Year's Day. Happy New Year, American seniors.

The Republican budget means seniors will pay more for Medicare. That is why 60 percent of the American public would like the President to veto this budget. And it is all part of a grand strategy, which is here with the very words of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH]:

We do not get rid of Medicare in round one because we do not think that that is politically smart, and we don't think that this is the right way to transition. We believe it is going to wither on the vine.

That is what we are doing, we are having Medicare wither on the vine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to observe again that many Members have indicated that they hope to leave this afternoon to get to Veterans Day events and the Chair would like to encourage Mem-

bers to move along. We will try to stick with the time allotments.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, could the Chair advise Members of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. OBEY] has 9½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. My colleagues, this place can be fun, and it has been fun the last half-hour or so. But I tend to think that people looking in, the folks we work for, think we are being a little frivolous just on the threshold of this Government shutting down and perhaps resulting in fiscal insolvency. I suggest we get a little less silly, put the charts away and commit to do what the President, within the hour, has asked us to do and that is stay here this weekend, compromise this out with him this weekend.

I know the Senate has gone, but we can bring PHIL GRAMM and BOB DOLE back from campaigning. NEWT GINGRICH can come back from signing books. We can go down to the White House and compromise with the President. We can get this done. Let us stop the silliness and agree to stay here this weekend as the President of the United States has requested we do.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to even direct it to the minority leader as well, Members want to go home this weekend. They want to work with their veterans, with the veterans parades, with the veterans organizations out of respect for them.

But let me tell Members, there are those of us like myself that are going to stay here this weekend. So is NEWT GINGRICH, so is BOB DOLE, so are our leaders and I hope your leaders as well. We are going to be here, and we are going to be working so the rest of my colleagues can go home to try to work out these differences. So let us stop this silliness.

If Members want to stay here, stay with us and we will work to resolve these problems.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask the gentleman, in fact, if the President were serious about negotiating these very complex and difficult issues, wouldn't he have spent some of the time that he spent on the airplane for 26 hours going and coming from Prime Minister Rabin's funeral to talk to the Speaker and to

talk to the Senate majority leader, other than to say hello? But, as I understand it, there was no discussion at all. And it was directly the responsibility of the President to initiate those conversations.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if I were the President of the United States, I would have been in the back of that plane talking to each and every one of you trying to sell you on my position. That is a responsible President.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It did not happen.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that this debate has become so trivialized that this bill is going to rise or fall based on how much the Speaker's ego was damaged because the President on the way to a state funeral for a fallen friend did not spend enough time schmoozing with the Speaker when he had two former Presidents in the plane and had a few things to do on the way.

If the Speaker is not bigger than that, if the majority's nose is out of joint on that, then we really do have a problem in this country.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I point out to the gentleman, look, we did not raise the issue about staying here. We have been working long hours, both parties have been working long hours trying to get these bill done. Let us not start posturing and saying we should stay all weekend when all we have to do is vote, get this bill out of here, send it over to the Senate. They will agree to this and send it to the President on time. The end of the time for the present continuing resolution is midnight, November 13. Then the President can sign this resolution. That is all he has to do and Government will continue.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, we share your desire to show respect for our veterans. It is just that we do not find much respect in cutting Medicare for 8.8 million veterans in this country who are Medicare eligible, nor do we find it appropriate that when you do not include the cuts on waste and fraud in this resolution, you do not include the cuts in health care expenditures. The only cuts you provide is for the veterans and the other people in America who rely on Medicare by raising their premiums come January. That is not much respect.

What this resolution does is to set up a procedure where by at 5 on Monday the Republicans in the House and the Republicans in the Senate still have not reached agreement. On the last day in which this continuing resolution is in effect, we will not know if they can agree among themselves on the future of this Government. And guess who is going to pick up the tab for it? It is

going to come at a cost of millions of dollars a day just to shut down the Government. Unless Rupert is giving NEWT GINGRICH another book contract, the taxpayer is going to have to pick up that tab.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, in order to clarify the misinformation, I brought a gentleman that knows what he is talking about on Medicare.

Mr. SPEAKER, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], the ranking chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Ways and Means, who is going to tell us the truth about Medicare.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am more than willing to do this over and over again. I apologize for not being here. We were in conference trying to move forward, as Members seemingly have asked us to do. But obviously when they misrepresent facts and obstruction the way you have.

Everybody in the United States knows, except those of you who are willing to admit you also know, Medicare is in trouble. Not on a partisan basis, on a bipartisan basis. It is an entitlement program that has to be checked, controlled and curbed. And it has to be done in a way that takes into consideration the interests of the beneficiaries who are receiving the benefits today and the people who are going to receive the benefits tomorrow. No one should argue that point.

It is perfectly legitimate to how you solve the program. There are a lot of different ways to solve it. I will tell you one way that is pure, unmitigated political hypocrisy. And that is to pander to seniors and say the way we are going to save Medicare is to reduce your premium. That is absolute pandering. You folks have done that for so many years, it is hard to break old habits, and we understand that.

But let me tell you what we have to do is every one in this society share in the problem. No one group can evade sharing in the problem.

You folks have asked people who are working over and over again to bear virtually the total cost of the program. Six times in the last 10 years you either increased the payroll tax or you increased the percentage that people have to pay into the payroll tax to cover up the problem in Medicare.

Finally, in 1993, you blew off the lid. No person in America makes enough money to evade the payroll tax that you increased to 1.45 percent on those individuals.

□ 1500

My colleagues' answer would be more of the same. If my colleagues do more of the same, it takes two to three times the increase on that payroll tax just to get us to the year 2002, the year in which the trustees said part A is going bankrupt, and my colleagues

cannot tolerate a 10-percent-plus-a-year increase in part B, they cannot tolerate it. If they do, even their honorable Senators on the other side, KERREY, said it is unsustainable, and they are going to give the seniors a reduction in the premium. Absolute pandering.

What we have to say is, "Seniors, will you bear your fair share?" And what is the seniors' fair share? Keep the premium where it is today. That is all we ask.

I am over there right now telling the Senators where they wanted to increase the deductible on seniors from \$100 to \$150 that that is unacceptable, where they said, "Let's index it," that that is unacceptable, where they wanted copays, that that is unacceptable. What we have said is all we ask of seniors is to keep the premium where it is, and my colleagues come down to this floor and pander: Hey, we want to reduce the premium for seniors.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues do not have any solutions; we do. Guess what it is? It is to take a look at what is going out in America every day today in health care. They are not paying 10-percent-a-year increases. What they are doing is saying create a choice structure that allows people through choice to get some of the benefits that the children and the grandchildren of today's beneficiaries get. They cannot do that right now because we have a closed government system that operates one way basically, and that is a fee-for-service system. What we are saying is, "Let's open up the fee-for-service system." What has happened in the private sector when it opened up the fee-for-service system to choice? That fee-for-service system is withering away, it is disappearing. It is no longer the predominant health care delivery system in California. It is 75 percent managed care.

What the Speaker said was that what is going on outside in the real world, the fee-for-service system withering away, should happen to Medicare if people choose to have it happen, and what we hope is that we create a program successfully enough to attract people to a positive program in terms of the growth so that the old-fashioned system that was increasing at 10 percent a year will not be the dominant system.

My colleagues better hope we are successful. I know they do not want to help us, but my colleagues better hope we are successful because, if we are not, this entitlement program is going to eat us all alive. We do not want to tell seniors they cannot have the old system.

Mr. Speaker, we do not want to tell the seniors that they have to do something. We want to work together to create a positive structure where young people and seniors sharing in the responsibility stave off bankruptcy and

reduce the cost of the Federal budget so we can balance our budget.

What we want out of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, is to simply join us and tell seniors, "Share, help us solve the problem, stay when you are on your premium, and we can solve the problem." What is their answer? Pander to seniors and reduce the premium. My colleagues are not only in the minority, they are outrageous.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure where my friend from California, Mr. THOMAS, went. I hope he gets his facts right.

Mr. Speaker, the reality is many of us supported an alternative which sustains Medicare, balances the budget, does not provide the type of premium increase for all elderly as in the Republican proposal on an appropriation bill. The reality is my colleagues do not have to go to 31½ percent of costs. I agree the premium should not go down. But my colleagues are having this huge jump, and at the same time we have millions of poor elderly widows who receive their premiums and their deductibles paid by Medicaid. My colleagues are also cutting that program. So, they are doing premium increases that are not required to stabilize Medicare to balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues are punishing poor, elderly widows because of their Medicaid cuts. That is right; they are mean cuts, and the reason they have to go so deep with the increase in their part B premiums, reductions of benefits to elderly, poor widows in most cases; and do not come with this language about protecting them, my colleagues are not, the facts do not bear our colleagues out in Medicaid; It is simply because they want to pay for their tax cut. We know where the bulk of those benefits go: 50 percent or more to people with incomes over \$100,000.

So let us get it straight. We do not need to do their extreme things. We can do it reasonably. But even forgetting about that, even if this were a reasonable approach, why should it be on the continuing resolution? Why? This is not a Medicare bill. Our friend from Louisiana has a continuing appropriations bill, and all of a sudden it is a Medicare bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. SPEAKER, the issue is not how much time the President has spent massaging the Speaker's ego on the airplane. The issue is whether or not we will try to force the President to provide for a huge increase in Medicare premiums as the price for keeping the Government going. That is not our obligation. Our obligation is to try to keep the Government going. We can do that with a clean resolution. That is what we ought to do.

Mr. SPEAKER, I yield the remaining 4½ minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in my view this is the most colossal waste of time and energy that I have seen. Our job as a Congress is to send the President legislation, and the President then either has to sign or to veto the legislation. I used to say the President's pen is worth two-thirds of us, and it is. Nothing is in the Constitution about negotiating on planes going to Israel; there is nothing in the Constitution about carrying on summit meetings and negotiations. The Constitution is clear. We send the legislation, and he signs or he vetoes the legislation.

We are now 6 weeks beyond the end of the fiscal year. The President has yet to receive the 13 appropriations bills that he was supposed to receive before that time came and went. He has yet to receive a budget bill. We call it by a funny name, a reconciliation bill. But it is a budget. He does not have it yet, and so here we are talking about a simple 2-week extension to keep the Government running and to keep interest rates from going up unnecessarily because we default on the debt.

Now in the midst of this legislation what our colleagues are insisting on doing is putting into this simple 2-week extension what they want to do in the budget by raising Medicare premiums, and we can argue until the cows come home on whether or not these premiums on Medicare should be increased. Most of us do not think they need to be increased like this, but whatever people's views, we should not be here at 3:10 Friday, November 10, 6 weeks after our work should have been done, talking about our ideological differences on Medicare or on who can lobby the Government.

When these bills get down to the President on Monday, or whenever they are going to get there, he is going to veto the bills, he has already said that, and then we are going to have to come back here and do what the Congress must do, which is to develop another 2-week increase, or an extension, or a week, or whatever it is that we can pass, so that the Government will keep going, and let me just say for those who were not here, sometimes in the past, when we had a day or two when the Government did not operate, it is not a good experience for any of us, and it sure is not a good experience for the American people. They expect that we came here to do the job, to pass the legislation, and then the President can decide what he is going to do.

Now I hope that we will get our wits together here in the next few days, and get a clean CR and a clean debt ceiling down to the President before bad things happen so he can sign them, so

we can then get down to the hard work of trying to reach an agreement that will reach a budget that is good for the American people. I am an optimist. I think we can do that, and I think we have the ability to figure that out in good will and in good faith. But we get nowhere by standing out here fighting about whether the ideological riders that we have in the budget should be in these simple 2-week extensions. It simply does us no good.

Now one final thing:

If we cannot reach a budget, and I hope we can, we may be back here talking about a year extension of a continuing resolution. I hope that does not happen, but, if we cannot agree, and maybe we cannot with the President on what this should be, then I think we ought to take these issues to the American people. We are talking about a 7-year budget. We are talking about a 7-year budget. We are talking about far-reaching changes in the Medicare Program. We are talking about far-reaching changes in the Medicaid Program. We are talking about a \$245 billion tax cut in the midst of trying to balance the budget in 7 years. Now if we cannot find that middle ground, and I am willing to try and find it, then I say let the President veto the bill, and let us do a 12-month extension without ideological riders, and let us proudly take these issues to the American people. They deserve the right to be cut into this decision, and I think I know the decision they are going to make.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has expired, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself all the remaining time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we have completed business on five bills; we have not on eight. There are a few touchups to do those, and we can get them to the President's desk after we pass this continuing resolution. When we do that, we will complete the process, complete the process to put this country on a glidepath toward a balanced budget by the year 2002, to reduce spending, to reduce taxes, to reduce the constant increase of Government from the other side, to reduce the bureaucracy, and to provide for freedom for the American people, higher productivity, and more jobs. But we cannot do it if we vote this down, which is what they want. They say this is a serious bill and that is why they are opposed to it.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues how serious their—our—Commander in Chief thinks it is. An AP wire—Associated Press—2:27 today; it says, and I quote:

"Less than an hour before the debt limit vote Clinton made a quick trip to the White House briefing room and then went golfing." He did not reiterate his threat to veto the bills.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are reaching an all-time low with their dirty tactics that threaten the livelihood of so many Americans by playing a game of political chicken.

It is irresponsible and wrong for the Republicans to attach legislative riders to the continuing resolution. If we had a clean CR, we would all be home celebrating Veterans Day by now.

But instead, the Republicans have attached so many draconian riders to this legislation. I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle this, What does raising Medicare premiums for seniors and placing lobbying restrictions on nonprofits have to do with keeping the Government up and running? Absolutely nothing.

I, for one, find it unconscionable that the Republicans are attaching so many extreme nongermane provisions to the continuing resolution and the debt limit extension. These irresponsible bills will leave President Clinton no choice but to veto them. As a result of these Republican shenanigans, veterans will not receive their disability checks, seniors will not receive their Medicare, and thousands of Federal employees in my district will be sent home next Tuesday in the wake of a Government shutdown.

It is dead wrong for the Republicans in Congress to play politics with peoples' lives.

□ 1515

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). Pursuant to House Resolution 261, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 172, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 786]

YEAS—224

Allard	Brewster	Cooley
Archer	Brownback	Cox
Armey	Bryant (TN)	Crane
Bachus	Bunn	Crapo
Baker (CA)	Bunning	Cremins
Baker (LA)	Burr	Cubin
Ballenger	Burton	Cunningham
Barr	Callahan	Davis
Barrett (NE)	Calvert	Deal
Bartlett	Camp	DeLay
Barton	Canady	Diaz-Balart
Bass	Castle	Doolittle
Bateman	Chabot	Dornan
Bereuter	Chambliss	Dreier
Bilbray	Chenoweth	Duncan
Blirakis	Christensen	Dunn
Bliley	Chrysler	Ehlers
Blute	Clinger	Ehrlich
Boehrlert	Coble	Emerson
Boehner	Coburn	English
Bonilla	Collins (GA)	Ensign
Bono	Combest	Everett

Ewing	Kelly	Riggs
Fawell	Kim	Roberts
Fields (TX)	King	Rogers
Flanagan	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Foley	Knollenberg	Ros-Lehtinen
Forbes	Kolbe	Roth
Fowler	LaHood	Roukema
Fox	Largent	Royce
Franks (CT)	Latham	Salmon
Franks (NJ)	LaTourrette	Sanford
Frelinghuysen	Laughlin	Saxton
Frisa	Lazio	Scarborough
Funderburk	Leach	Schaefer
Gallely	Lewis (KY)	Schiff
Ganske	Lightfoot	Seastrand
Gekas	Linder	Sensenbrenner
Geren	Livingston	Shadegg
Gilchrist	LoBlando	Shaw
Gillmor	Longley	Shays
Gilman	Lucas	Skeen
Goodlatte	Manzullo	Smith (MI)
Goodling	Martini	Smith (TX)
Goss	McCollum	Smith (WA)
Graham	McCrery	Solomon
Greenwood	McDade	Souder
Gunderson	McInnis	Spence
Gutknecht	McIntosh	Stearns
Hall (TX)	McKeon	Stump
Hancock	Metcalfe	Talent
Hansen	Mica	Tate
Hastert	Miller (FL)	Tauzin
Hastings (WA)	Molinar	Taylor (MS)
Hayes	Montgomery	Taylor (NC)
Hayworth	Moorhead	Thornberry
Hefley	Morella	Tiahrt
Heineman	Myers	Torkildsen
Herger	Myrick	Upton
Hilleary	Nethercutt	Vucanovich
Hobson	Ney	Waldholtz
Hoekstra	Norwood	Walker
Hoke	Nussle	Walsh
Horn	Oxley	Wamp
Hostettler	Packard	Watts (OK)
Houghton	Paxon	Weldon (FL)
Hunter	Petri	Weller
Hutchinson	Pombo	White
Hyde	Porter	Whitfield
Inglis	Portman	Wicker
Istook	Pryce	Wolf
Johnson (CT)	Radanovich	Young (AK)
Johnson, Sam	Ramstad	Zeliff
Jones	Regula	Zimmer
Kasich		

NAYS—172

Abercrombie	Dixon	Kennedy (RI)
Ackerman	Doggett	Kennedy
Andrews	Dooley	Kildee
Baessler	Doyle	Kleczka
Baldacci	Durbin	Klink
Barcia	Edwards	Lantos
Barrett (WI)	Engel	Levin
Becerra	Eshoo	Lewis (GA)
Beilenson	Evans	Lincoln
Bentsen	Farr	Lipinski
Bevill	Fattah	Lofgren
Bishop	Filner	Lowey
Bonior	Flake	Luther
Borski	Foglietta	Maloney
Browder	Ford	Manton
Brown (CA)	Frost	Markey
Brown (FL)	Furse	Mascara
Brown (OH)	Gejdenson	Matsui
Bryant (TX)	Gephardt	McCarthy
Cardin	Gibbons	McDermott
Chapman	Gonzalez	McHale
Clay	Gordon	McKinney
Clayton	Green	McNulty
Clement	Gutierrez	Meek
Clyburn	Hall (OH)	Menendez
Coleman	Hamilton	Mfume
Collins (IL)	Harman	Miller (CA)
Collins (MI)	Hastings (FL)	Minge
Condit	Hefner	Mink
Conyers	Hilliard	Moakley
Costello	Hinche	Mollohan
Coyne	Holden	Moran
Cramer	Hoyer	Murtha
Danner	Jackson-Lee	Nadler
de la Garza	Jacobs	Neal
DeFazio	Jefferson	Oberstar
DeLauro	Johnson (SD)	Obey
Dellums	Johnson, E. B.	Oliver
Deutsch	Kanjorski	Ortiz
Dicks	Kennedy (MA)	Orton

Pallone	Sawyer	Torres
Pastor	Schroeder	Towns
Payne (NJ)	Schumer	Trafigant
Payne (VA)	Scott	Velazquez
Pelosi	Serrano	Visclosky
Peterson (MN)	Sisisky	Volkmer
Pomeroy	Skaggs	Ward
Poshard	Skelton	Waters
Rahall	Slaughter	Watt (NC)
Rangel	Smith (NJ)	Williams
Reed	Stark	Wilson
Richardson	Stenholm	Wise
Rivers	Stokes	Woolsey
Roemer	Stupak	Wyden
Roybal-Allard	Tanner	Wynn
Rush	Tejeda	Yates
Sabo	Thompson	
Sanders	Thurman	

NOT VOTING—36

Berman	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Boucher	Martinez	Spratt
Buyer	McHugh	Stockman
Dickey	Meehan	Studds
Dingell	Neumann	Thomas
Fazio	Owens	Thornton
Fields (LA)	Parker	Torricelli
Frank (MA)	Peterson (FL)	Tucker
Johnston	Pickett	Vento
Kaptur	Quillen	Waxman
Klug	Quinn	Weldon (PA)
LaFalce	Rose	Young (FL)

□ 1533

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Quinn for, with Mr. LaFalce against.
Mr. Young of Florida for, with Mr. Waxman against.
Mr. Quillen for, with Ms. Kaptur against.
Mr. Lewis of California for, with Mr. Johnston of Florida against.

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise their remarks and include extraneous material on the motion to agree to Senate amendments on H.R. 2586 adopted earlier today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1995

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2394), to increase, effective as of December 1, 1995, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 1995".

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION.

(a) RATE ADJUSTMENT.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, effective on December 1, 1995, increase the dollar amounts in effect for the payment of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation by the Secretary, as specified in subsection (b).

(b) AMOUNTS TO BE INCREASED.—The dollar amounts to be increased pursuant to subsection (a) are the following:

(1) COMPENSATION.—Each of the dollar amounts in effect under section 1114 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS.—Each of the dollar amounts in effect under section 1115(1) of such title.

(3) CLOTHING ALLOWANCE.—The dollar amount in effect under section 1162 of such title.

(4) NEW DIC RATES.—The dollar amounts in effect under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1311(a) of such title.

(5) OLD DIC RATES.—Each of the dollar amounts in effect under section 1311(a)(3) of such title.

(6) ADDITIONAL DIC FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES WITH MINOR CHILDREN.—The dollar amount in effect under section 1311(b) of such title.

(7) ADDITIONAL DIC FOR DISABILITY.—The dollar amounts in effect under sections 1311(c) and 1311(d) of such title.

(8) DIC FOR DEPENDENT CHILDREN.—The dollar amounts in effect under sections 1313(a) and 1314 of such title.

(c) DETERMINATION OF PERCENTAGE INCREASE.—(1) The increase under subsection (a) shall be made in the dollar amounts specified in subsection (b) as in effect on November 30, 1995. Each such amount shall be increased by the same percentage as the percentage by which benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) are increased effective December 1, 1995, as a result of a determination under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).

(2) In the computation of increased dollar amounts pursuant to paragraph (1), any amount which as so computed is not an even multiple of \$1 shall be rounded to the next lower whole dollar amount.

(d) SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases made under subsection (a), the rates of disability compensation payable to persons within the purview of section 10 of Public Law 85-857 (72 Stat. 1263) who are not in receipt of compensation payable pursuant to chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 3. PUBLICATION OF ADJUSTED RATES.

At the same time as the matters specified in section 215(i)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)(2)(D)) are required to be published by reason of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act during fiscal year 1996, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall publish in the Federal Register the amounts specified in section 2(b), as increased pursuant to section 2.

Mr. STUMP (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

the Senate amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not plan to object, and I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] for an explanation of his request.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, the only substantive difference is that the Senate bill does not include language regarding the basis for the DIC COLA.

This matter will be included in the budget reconciliation bill.

We are seeking unanimous consent because this bill must be enacted quickly.

The VA needs time to program their computer system so that veterans may receive the COLA in the January 1, 1996, benefit checks.

The Congressional Budget Office has indicated the bill reduces direct spending under the pay-as-you-go budget rules.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Very briefly, the increases that have been mentioned by the chairman is 2.6 percent effective for service-connected veterans in December. Tomorrow is Veterans Day for all veterans who fought in the different wars, and this is for the disabled veterans. It will also go to the Gold Star wives, a cost-of-living.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the initial request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2394.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would be pleased to yield to the distinguished majority leader for the purposes of apprising the House on the schedule for next week.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, November 13, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

We plan to consider 11 bills under suspension of the rules. I won't read through the long list now, but a list of those suspensions will be distributed to Members' offices today and will appear in the RECORD.

The suspensions are as follows:

H.R. 2527, permitting electronic filing and preservation of Federal Election Commission reports;

H.R. 2204, the Defense Production Act;

H.R. 924, prohibition on certain transfers of national forest lands;

H.R. 657, extending Federal Power Act deadline for construction of three Arkansas hydroelectric projects;

H.R. 680, extending the time for construction of certain FERC licensed hydro projects;

H.R. 1011, extending Federal Power Act deadline for construction of an Ohio hydroelectric project;

H.R. 1014, authorizing extension of time limitation for a FERC-issued hydroelectric license;

H.R. 1051, providing for extension of certain West Virginia hydroelectric projects;

H.R. 1290, reinstating the permit and extending the Federal Power Act deadline for the construction of an Oregon hydroelectric project;

H.R. 1335, providing for the extension of a West Virginia hydroelectric project; and

H.R. 1366, authorizing the extension of time limitation for the FERC-issued hydroelectric license for the Mount Hope waterpower project.

Members should be advised that any recorded votes ordered on the suspensions will be postponed until 5 p.m. Monday.

On Tuesday, November 14, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning hour and 10 a.m. for legislative business. We will first take up two bills on the Corrections Day Calendar:

H.R. 2366, a bill to repeal an unnecessary medical device reporting requirement; and

S. 790, the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995.

After consideration of the corrections day bills and for the balance of the week, the House will take up the following bills, all of which will be considered under the rules:

H.R. 2539, the ICC Elimination Act;

H.R. 1058, the Securities Litigation Reform conference report;

H.R. 2126, the fiscal year 1996 Department of Defense appropriations conference report;

H.R. 1977, the fiscal year 1996 Department of the Interior appropriations conference report;

H.R. 2564, the Lobbyist Disclosure Reform Act;

House Resolution 250, the Congressional Gift Reform Act; and

H.R. 2491, the Seven-Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995.

Of course, Members should keep in mind that additional conference reports may be brought to the floor at any time.

Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, November 16, it is our hope to finish business on the budget reconciliation and recess for the Thanksgiving district work period until Tuesday, November 28. However, Members should keep their schedules flexible toward the end of next week as we may have to continue work on the important business of balancing the budget.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for going through that schedule.

Mr. Leader, when the President vetoes the CR, what do you plan to do on Monday to preclude the Government from shutting down on Tuesday?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

As the gentleman knows, we have taken action on the continuing resolution. The Senate will consider that action. We should have action completed on the CR in ample time for the President to sign the bill in order to prevent any shutdown of the Government. Of course, we have every expectation that the President will do so.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, as the lawyers would say, assuming for argument's sake. I will not use the Latin, but—

Mr. ARMEY. I may dare say, the gentleman may find an argument without assuming it, the way things have been going today, but we will try not to.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, very seriously, we have been debating pretty hotly the question of whether or not the CR, in fact, will do what we want to do, I think most of us want to do, and that is keep the Government open.

In point of fact, it has to go to the Senate. The Senate has gone home; the Senate is not here, because we changed it over here. Presumably, they therefore cannot act on it until Monday morning. Presumably, from what the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] said, and I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] also said, the Senate is going to take the amended CR, so they will send it to the President.

The President has said, without question, he is going to veto the CR as it stands now with the Medicaid premium increase.

My question, therefore, is assuming that that happens, and assuming that we do not want to shut down the Government, you have not indicated on there a timeframe in which we might continue to pass another CR which would provide for the Government's operation on Tuesday, November 13. Is there such a contingency plan?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his inquiry.

I had not understood that the President had stipulated that he would require to find Medicaid payment increases in the bill as a reason for his veto. Since there will be none found in the bill, I remain confident that the President will sign it and we will have no problems to deal with.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, I understand that we can be rhetorically cute with one another, and I think probably both of us could be reasonably good at that, but the fact of the matter is, I think it would be irresponsible for us, Mr. Leader, not to provide a contingency for this House to consider the possibility at the very least that we will have to act again on Monday on this legislation.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will try to be clear.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman addresses his question to me, I can tell the gentleman I have no reason to expect the President to veto the bill. I see no reason for me to speculate about what would be the behavior I would make with respect to a veto that has not been taken.

If the President should veto the bill, at that time we will make what preparation is necessary to deal with the President's veto, but the President has not vetoed the bill. I personally will assure the gentleman from Maryland that I have no expectation that the President will veto the bill. However, if he should, we will deal with his veto as we do in response to the President's veto message, which I expect perhaps in this case might tell us why he vetoes the bill, and I am sure we can respond.

Mr. HOYER. I am sure it will.

Mr. Speaker, if I could ask the gentleman, the gentleman indicates that the 7-year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995, H.R. 2491, will be considered next week. Our conferees have not heard anything about a conference. Could you apprise us on this side of the aisle when a conference might occur on this legislation?

Mr. ARMEY. I would encourage your conferees to get in touch with the conference, and I am sure that they will have an opportunity to work on the material before we report the conference report to the floor.

□ 1545

Mr. HOYER. I thank the leader for that comment.

Frankly our conferees have been looking for the conference and have been unable to find it. Can the gentleman tell us where it is?

Mr. ARMEY. I do appreciate the gentleman's difficulty. The gentleman's difficulty is understandable in that the Senate has not yet been able to appoint conferees pursuant to the threat of a filibuster by the minority in the Senate. We, of course, hope that that

progress will be made and then the conference can be found.

Mr. HOYER. Is the scheduling of that bill contingent, I presume, on the fact that they will have a conference? We would not bring it to the floor without a conference?

Mr. ARMEY. We would, of course, remain optimistic as we do with respect to actions we expect from the gentlemen from the other side of the building.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, all of us are concerned about what is going to happen next Thursday. Does the gentleman expect to get out next Thursday pursuant to the schedule?

Mr. ARMEY. Yes, I do. But of course I have learned over my 10 years here to be flexible in my expectations regarding when I will get out when we are in the end times.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, two additional questions. We dropped the Istook amendment today by motion of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

In light of the fact that that was the only thing holding up the Treasury-Postal bill, is it the gentleman's expectation the Treasury-Postal bill might move next week?

Mr. ARMEY. I am very anxious to get together with the conferees and see what they can work out.

Mr. HOYER. With respect to the Interior appropriation bill, does the gentleman have any information for us on that?

Mr. ARMEY. We are, of course, hopeful that that, too, will be worked out next week. The conferees are working on these bills.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). The Chair wishes to inform the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] that his 1 minute is rapidly expiring.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. I will keep close watch on the clock.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I have a very brief but I think important question to the gentleman. In a moment it is my understanding we will have an opportunity to vote for or against a motion to adjourn.

If that motion passes, is it my understanding that this House will be in recess the rest of Friday afternoon, all day Saturday, all day Sunday, and that this House will not go back into session until less than 12 hours before the Federal Government goes in default; is that correct?

Mr. HOYER. In answer to the gentleman's question, as I understand what the majority leader has said, there will be no votes expected until 5 on Monday. So it will be 7 hours before we shut down Government.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

NOVEMBER 13, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, in light of the information that we have that some Members on the minority side intended to call a recorded vote on the motion to adjourn that would have occurred later this evening after special orders while our Members were scattered throughout the country, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, yeas 156, not voting 112, as follows:

[Roll No. 787]

AYES—164

Allard	Chenoweth	Frisa
Archer	Christensen	Funderburk
Armey	Chrysler	Galleghy
Baker (CA)	Coble	Ganske
Ballenger	Collins (GA)	Gekas
Barr	Combest	Gillmor
Barrett (NE)	Cox	Gilman
Bartlett	Crapo	Goodlatte
Bateman	Cremins	Goodling
Bereuter	Cubin	Graham
Bilirakis	Cunningham	Gunderson
Bliley	DeLay	Gutknecht
Blute	Doolittle	Hancock
Boehlert	Dornan	Hansen
Boehner	Dreier	Hastert
Bonilla	Duncan	Hastings (WA)
Bono	Ehrlich	Hayworth
Bryant (TN)	Emerson	Hefley
Bunn	English	Heineman
Bunning	Flanagan	Herger
Burr	Forbes	Hilleary
Calvert	Fox	Hobson
Castle	Franks (CT)	Hoke
Chabot	Franks (NJ)	Hostettler
Chambliss	Frelinghuysen	Hunter

Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingalls
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzuillo
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McInnis

McKeon
Metcalfe
Meyers
Mica
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton

Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Skeen
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Talent
Tate
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Traffant
Upton
Waldholtz
Walker
Watts (OK)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Zimmer

Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Foley
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Gejdenson
Gordon
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hoekstra
Houghton
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
King
Klug
LaFalce
Laughlin

Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Longley
Manton
Martinez
Martini
McDermott
McHugh
McIntosh
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Murtha
Myers
Neumann
Owens
Parker
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Quillen
Quinn
Rangel
Richardson
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Scarborough
Shaw

Shuster
Smith (MI)
Spratt
Stockman
Studds
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Tucker
Velázquez
Vento
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Wamp
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOES—156

Abercrombie
Andrews
Bachus
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Borski
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Canady
Cardin
Chapman
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
Deutsch
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Foglietta

Frost
Furse
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Goss
Green
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson, E.B.
Kanjorski
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran

Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Poshary
Rahall
Reed
Rivers
Roemer
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Solomon
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thurman
Torres
Towns
Visclosky
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn

NOT VOTING—112

Ackerman
Baker (LA)
Bass
Berman
Bonior
Boucher
Brownback
Burton
Buyer

Callahan
Camp
Clay
Clinger
Conyers
Cooley
Crane
Deal
DeLauro

Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dunn
Dunbar
Ehlers

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, November 13, 1995, at 12:30 p.m.

□ 1604

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1634. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report of the Maritime Administration [MARAD] for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. app. 1118; to the Committee on National Security.

1635. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a copy of the annual report on the Coke Oven Emission Control Program for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to Public Law 101-549, section 301 (104 Stat. 2559); to the Committee on Commerce.

1636. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the quarterly report on the Strategic Petroleum Reserve for the first quarter of 1995, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 6245(a); to the Committee on Commerce.

1637. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled "Energy Policy Act Transportation Study: Interim Report on Natural Gas Flows and Rates," pursuant to Public Law 102-486, section 1340(c) (106 Stat. 2993); to the Committee on Commerce.

1638. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal certain divestiture laws applying only to Department of Energy employees; to the Committee on Commerce.

1639. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled "1993 Annual Report on Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management Progress"; to the Committee on Commerce.

1640. A letter from the Administrator, United States Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's report entitled "Volatile Organic Compound Emissions for Consumer and Commercial Products," pursuant to section 183(e) of the Clean Air Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

1641. A letter from the General Counsel, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, transmitting copies of English and Russian texts of three implementing agreements negotiated by the Joint Compliance and Inspection Commission [JCIC] for the START Treaty; to the Committee on International Relations.

1642. A letter from the Associate Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1994, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1643. A letter from the President, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1994 through March 31, 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1644. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1994, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1645. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1994, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1646. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Resources.

1647. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 1994 Section 8 Report on National Historic and Natural Landmarks that have been damaged or to which damage to their integrity is anticipated, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1a-5(a); to the Committee on Resources.

1648. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act establishing Lowell National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

1649. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Federal Power Administration Transfer Act"; to the Committee on Resources.

1650. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report on information gathered by the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration on Buy America waivers granted during fiscal years 1992 and 1993, pursuant to Public Law 102-240, section 1048(b) (105 Stat. 1999); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1651. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's annual report entitled "Activities Relating to the Deepwater Port Act of 1974," for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 1519; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1652. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's first annual report entitled "Alaska Demonstration Programs"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1653. A letter from the Administrator, United States Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting two drafts of proposed

legislation entitled "U.S.-Mexico Border Water Pollution Control Act" and "U.S. Colonias Water Pollution Control Act," pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1654. A letter from the Administrator, United States Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants for water infrastructure improvements in Bristol County, MA, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1655. A letter from the Administrator, United States Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants for improvements to the New Orleans sewer system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1656. A letter from the Administrator, United States Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants to needy cities for the purpose of constructing secondary treatment facilities, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1657. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the quarterly report on the expenditure and need for worker adjustment assistance training funds under the Trade Act of 1974, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2296(a)(2); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 2519. A bill to facilitate contributions to charitable organizations by codifying certain exemptions from the Federal securities laws, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 104-333). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 2614. A bill to reform the commemorative coin programs of the U.S. Mint in order to protect the integrity of such programs and prevent losses of Government funds, to authorize the U.S. Mint to mint and issue platinum and gold bullion coins, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 2615. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on dichlorofopmethyl; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2616. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on thidiazuron; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. FOX, and Mr. UNDERWOOD):

H.R. 2617. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt small issues from the restrictions on the deduction by fi-

nancial institutions for interest, to disregard certain amounts of capital expenditures in applying \$10,000,000 limit on such issues, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 2618. A bill to provide for the therapeutic use of marihuana in situations involving life-threatening or sense-threatening illnesses and to provide adequate supplies of marihuana for such use; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GEJDENSON (for himself and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 2619. A bill to impose sanctions on foreign persons exporting certain goods or technology that would enhance Iran's ability to explore, extract, refine, or produce petroleum products or natural gas; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Banking and Financial Services, and Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GILCHREST:

H.R. 2620. A bill to direct the Architect of the Capitol to sell the parcel of real property located at 501 First Street, SE., in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.J. Res. 118. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. BARR, Mr. JONES, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. EWING, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. CRANE, Mr. KING, Mr. BONO, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MFUME, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. WICKER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BUYER, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. BLILEY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HANCOCK, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DOOLEY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MCDADE, and Mr. RADANOVICH):

H. Res. 264. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to require

greater disclosure of gifts; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 325: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 739: Mr. NEUMANN and Mrs. CUBIN.
H.R. 820: Mr. WELLER, Mr. SABO, Mr. LUTHER and Mr. VENTO.
H.R. 1023: Mr. PACKARD and Mr. ROSE.
H.R. 1406: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. BASS.
H.R. 1627: Mr. LONGLEY and Mr. HAMILTON.
H.R. 1686: Mr. GREENWOOD.
H.R. 1733: Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas and Mr. LEWIS of California.
H.R. 1893: Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TORRES, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. BRYANT of Texas.
H.R. 2036: Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas.
H.R. 2090: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. ENSIGN, and Mr. MINGE.
H.R. 2138: Mr. GRAHAM and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2200: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. SPENCE.
H.R. 2351: Mr. ENSIGN.
H.R. 2420: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 2429: Mrs. CLAYTON and Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 2462: Mr. NEUMANN and Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 2468: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 2500: Mr. HOSTETTLER and Mr. GOODLING.
H.R. 2507: Mrs. SEASTRAND and Mr. CHRYSLER.
H.R. 2519: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. STUMP, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2579: Ms. NORTON, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. FROST, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2598: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALSH, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. BUNN of Oregon, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. HANCOCK, Ms. RIVERS, Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. CHRYSLER, and Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 26: Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. LAZIO of New York, and Mrs. THURMAN.
H. Res. 184: Mr. FARR.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1963: Mr. FLAKE.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

46. By the SPEAKER: Petition of National Association of Secretaries of State, relative to the National Voter Registration Act; to the Committee on House Oversight.

47. Also, petition of National Association of Secretaries of State, relative to urging zero tolerance for violence directed against

public employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXVII, the following discharge petitions were filed:

Petition No. 5, November 7, 1995, by Mr. SCHUMER on House Resolution 240, was signed by the following Members: Charles Schumer and Louise McIntosh Slaughter.

Petition No. 6, November 8, 1995, by Mr. BRYANT of Texas on House Resolution 240, was signed by the following Members: John Bryant, Jim McDermott, George Miller, Martin T. Meehan, Vic Fazio, Frank Mascara, Patricia Schroeder, Lloyd Doggett, Zoe Lofgren, Charles E. Schumer, Carolyn B.

E. Wise, Jr., Gene Green, Bruce F. Vento, Major R. Owens, Tom Bevil, James L. Oberstar, Sam Gibbons, Jerrold Nadler, Xavier Becerra, Glenn Poshard, Fortney Pete Stark, Tom Lantos, Harold L. Volkmer, Ronald D. Coleman, W. G. (Bill) Hefner, Richard A. Gephardt, Sheila Jackson-Lee, David E. Skaggs, Sam Gejdenson, Maxine Waters, James A. Barcia, Collin C. Peterson, Dale E. Kildee, Barney Frank, Barbara-Rose Collins, Thomas M. Foglietta, and Sam Farr.

Petition No. 7, November 9, 1995, by Mr. KANJORSKI on House Resolution 246, was signed by the following Members: Paul E. Kanjorski, Michael F. Doyle, Frank Mascara, Nita M. Lowey, Barbara B. Kennelly, John W. Olver, Earl Pomeroy, Ken Bentsen, Thomas M. Barrett, Bart Stupak, Martin T. Meehan, and Mike Ward.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ABUSES AT DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

HON. W.J. (BILLY) TAUZIN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 10, 1995

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I read with dismay this morning's story about the foolish waste of taxpayer dollars by staff at the Secretary of Energy's office to pay for consultative review of press coverage of the Secretary and her Department. It is but one more example of agency spending on image building and lobbying that I hope to address in legislation which Mr. CLINGER and I are now preparing. We cannot and should not tolerate such abuses any longer.

But if one is to legitimately call upon the President to ask for the Secretary's resignation over this, we should be prepared to ask that the entire Cabinet resign. Every department in one form or another, is equally guilty of abusive waste and inappropriate spending on image building, lobbying, and public relations efforts. All of which should be equally condemned and rendered illegal. Secretary O'Leary is entitled to no special favors on this.

Energy Secretary O'Leary's standing in our Government and the Cabinet should not be called into question on this incident. She should be judged and regarded by how successfully she conducts the proper affairs of the Department of Energy, and on that basis she has every right and duty to continue her service to the President and to our Nation.

Secretary O'Leary and every Cabinet official, however, need to instruct their collective staff to end this practice of public relations spending and inappropriate lobbying. If they are unable to do so, the Congress, I believe, is ready to make those practices illegal, as they are both dumb and inexcusable.

CONFRONTING THE MYTHS

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 10, 1995

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, how about a dose of reality? The following article by Prof. Fran Quigley was published by the Nuvo Newsweekly in Indianapolis.

P.S. If the present welfare system as we mistakenly "know it" is so bad, ask yourself this question: Why did President Ronald Reagan sign it into law in 1988?

[From the Nuvo Newsweekly, Nov. 2-9, 1995]

CONFRONTING THE MYTHS—THE TRUTH ABOUT POVERTY AND WELFARE

(By Prof. Fran Quigley)

"Welfare as we know it" is coming to an end. True to the campaign promises of both

President Clinton and the Republican Congress, our country's system of providing guarantees of federal income assistance to poor families through the program of Aid to Families with Dependent Children is being dismantled. In its place will be state-run programs of assistance, including strict time limitations on the receipt of benefits, mandates that parents work outside the home and potentially a blanket denial of assistance to children of teenage mothers.

In Indiana, the changes to "welfare as we know it" are even more radical. In June of this year, most Indiana recipients of AFDC were notified that they would be subject to new rules that limit their lifetime enrollment on the program to two years and would be subject to a "family cap," where the state refuses to provide any additional benefits to families for new children conceived while the mother was enrolled in the AFDC program. In light of the conventional wisdom that has the Democratic party as the defender of the nation's poor, the irony of these stricter state provisions is that Democratic Governor Evan Bayh has sponsored and defended the two-year limitation and the family cap, while many Senate Republicans recently rejected these same provisions as too onerous for the poor.

All of these changes have come as a result of immense popular support for elected officials to change "welfare as we know it." But what exactly is welfare as we know it? It turns out that once the programs and the people enrolled in them are examined beyond rhetoric about "lazy deadbeats" and "welfare queens," that actual data show that many of the assumptions of the welfare debate are incorrect.

Some of these assumptions are so prevalent that they have taken on the status of myths. It is a dangerous situation when these myths have a place at the center of the welfare debate and now the dismantling of the family safety net. In order to take an informed position on the changes in our government's role in assisting the poor, these myths need to be confronted by the cold, hard, statistical truth:

MYTH NO. 1: IF POOR PEOPLE WOULD JUST GET JOBS, THEY WOULD NO LONGER BE POOR

Truth: In 1990s America, poverty is now a problem for working people and their families. In 1969, full-time employment at a minimum-wage job provided enough income to keep a family of three out of poverty. In 1992, full-time minimum-wage employment provided only 76 percent of the income needed to keep that same family above the federal government's estimate of the poverty level, and only 50 percent of the income estimated to be necessary for a three-person family to live a safe and healthy lifestyle in Indianapolis.

Implicit in this "get a job" myth and much of the anti-welfare rhetoric is the notion that poor people are poor because they are too lazy to work. However, noted welfare and poverty researcher Joel Handler describes empirical studies showing that poor people, including people receiving welfare, usually a well-developed work ethic and, in fact, most do work at jobs that simply do not pay enough salary to keep their families out of poverty.

Those who do not work outside the home usually are raising families, and the financial difficulties of maintaining employment, child care, transportation and health care are often responsible for forcing single parents out of the workplace. Also, any description of AFDC recipients as not "working" ignores the reality that raising children is both difficult and important work: Anyone who has raised children must reject the "lazy" description for a single mother who is raising kids in an environment of substandard housing, violence and constant financial uncertainty.

MYTH NO. 2: ONCE A PERSON RECEIVES WELFARE BENEFITS, HIS FINANCIAL NEEDS WILL BE MET

Truth: Receipt of Aid to Families with Dependent Children in Indiana provides a family with less than one-third of the income needed to meet the federal government estimate of the poverty level. A disabled adult's Supplemental Security Income provides a little over 54 percent of the estimated income necessary to meet the poverty level for a two-person family. AFDC benefit levels vary among states, but the median state AFDC maximum monthly benefit level for a family of three was only \$366, which is barely more than a third of the federal poverty line. The grim implication of these figures is that our streets and shelters are full of families with children who are homeless and/or hungry, yet are receiving the maximum welfare benefits allowed.

MYTH NO. 3: WOMEN HAVE BABIES IN ORDER TO RECEIVE LARGER WELFARE CHECKS

Truth: Since Indiana's average AFDC monthly increase totals only \$65 per additional child, as contrasted with the federal government's quite modest estimate of a \$200-plus increased monthly cost of living per child Indiana's welfare recipients do not have any financial incentive to have babies. In fact, most welfare mothers do not have a large number of children: 73 percent of all AFDC recipients have only one or two children. AFDC recipients with more than three children constitute only 10 percent of the total number of families enrolled in the program.

MYTH NO. 4: MOST WELFARE RECIPIENTS ARE AFRICAN AMERICAN, LONGTIME DEPENDENTS AND TEENAGE PARENTS

Truth: All of these descriptive adjectives are incorrect as applied to AFDC recipients. African-Americans only make up 37 percent of all AFDC recipients (down from 45 percent in 1969), over half of all recipients leave the AFDC program within one year, and only 8 percent of recipients are under the age of 20.

MYTH NO. 5: PROGRAMS TO HELP THE POOR ARE TOO EXPENSIVE FOR STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BUDGETS

Truth: Don't blame the poor for budget deficits without looking in the mirror first: All the direct aid to the poor (AFDC, Medicaid, Food Stamps, and SSI) together does not equal three of the tax breaks benefiting the middle class and wealthy (deductions for retirement plans, home mortgage interest deductions, and exemptions for employer-paid health insurance premiums). Put another way, the AFDC program consumes only 1

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

percent of the federal budget and 2 percent of the average state budget.

Also, government investments in the well-being of our nation's poor, especially poor children, are cost-effective because of the programs' prevention of future social costs. For example, every dollar spent on Head Start programs is estimated to save \$4.75 in later special education, crime, welfare and other costs. Similar estimates have every dollar spent on childhood immunization or drug treatment saving \$10 in later medical costs or social costs.

MYTH NO. 6: HOUSING ASSISTANCE IS WIDELY AVAILABLE TO POOR PEOPLE

Truth: There is often at least a two-year waiting list for public or subsidized housing in Marion County if the housing unit is even accepting applications, and these existing programs are at risk of reduction or elimination by the current Congress. Subsidized housing is vital to poor people because the federal government's recommendation that people pay 30 percent of their income on housing and utilities is an otherwise impossible goal for most AFDC recipients. For example, the 1993 fair market value for an Indianapolis two-bedroom apartment is \$523, which represents 156 percent of the monthly income of a three-person family receiving AFDC.

In fact, most poor people in Indianapolis pay over 50 percent of their income in housing costs. Some of the hypocrisy of the anti-welfare rhetoric based on allegations of budget-busting is demonstrated by the government's commitment to providing significant housing benefits for the decidedly non-poor. For every dollar spent by the federal government on low-income housing assistance, \$3 of housing assistance is provided to high-income persons (incomes in the top 20 percent) through homeowner tax deductions.

MYTH NO. 7: PRIVATE CHARITIES CAN REPLACE GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS TO HELP THE POOR

Truth: Private charitable programs currently spend only about 1 percent as much as state and federal governments on social services, and many of those private services are provided by agencies heavily dependent on government funds. The major charitable providers of social services, including Salvation Army, Catholic Charities USA and Feed the Children, have taken the position that government has a necessary role in helping the poor. Leaders of these organizations predict disastrous consequences for the poor if the government significantly reduces its role in providing a social safety net.

MYTH NO. 8: THE UNITED STATES PROVIDES THE OPPORTUNITY FOR PERSONS IN POVERTY TO SIMPLY PULL THEMSELVES UP INTO THE MIDDLE CLASS

Truth: For most poor people, 1995 America is not the land of opportunity. The gap between the rich and poor in our society is the largest of any industrialized nation, and the percentage of poor people who are able to move out of poverty has steadily decreased in the last several decades. Even though current efforts to solve the United States' poverty problem focus on reducing or eliminating government programs, it is the more generous and pervasive family benefit programs that are generally cited as the source of the greater amount of class mobility and lower amount of poverty in comparable countries.

Dire consequences are predicted as a result of changes to our current welfare system, with poverty experts and service providers predicting everything from widespread rioting to a future where children sleeping on

sidewalk heating grates will be a common sight. The lesson to be taken from exposing the fallacy of the myths that motivated these changes is that the very survival of our country's poor families is put at risk based on misconceptions and prejudices, rather than clear-eyed examination of the effectiveness of the current welfare programs. While it may not yet be clear what the consequences of changing welfare will have for the poor and for the rest of us, it is clear that we have eliminated "welfare as we know it" when we did not really "know it" in the first place.

GREAT MILITARY FACILITIES IN FLORIDA

HON. TILLIE K. FOWLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 10, 1995

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that I take great pride in all the fine military installations we have in Florida. That said, however, I must admit that I have a special place in my heart for the facilities in my own district and the surrounding communities. These facilities are all truly outstanding, and they just keep getting better.

I learned yesterday afternoon that both Naval Station Mayport and the Mayport-based Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair Jacksonville—SUPSHIP Jacksonville—have been selected as finalists for the President's Quality Award. This prestigious award is the Federal equivalent of the private sector's Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award for excellence in quality management.

While there are literally thousands of eligible candidates in the Federal Government, only 10 finalists are chosen for this award each year. This year, two of them are from my district—and this is Mayport's second year in a row as a finalist.

I think my colleagues will all agree with me that this is an extraordinary achievement. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Capt. Scott Cantil, the CO of Mayport, and Capt. Richard T. Holmes, the CO of SUPSHIP Jacksonville, on their fine leadership. Even more importantly, though, I want to commend the men and women of Mayport and SUPSHIP—both military and civilian—who work so hard every day to achieve such a high standard of excellence. As a friend, a neighbor, and a longtime admirer, I am very, very proud of them all.

Mr. Speaker, these individuals do honor to the Navy, the U.S. Government, and the State of Florida, and it is my honor to represent them in the U.S. Congress.

U.S.S. "SANTEE" VETERANS

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 10, 1995

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gallant men of the U.S.S. *Santee* who served during World War II.

Between 1942–45, the U.S.S. *Santee* served in several war zones and took part in

numerous combat missions. Operating in the most advanced areas, the U.S.S. *Santee* and her attached air squadron frequently struck enemy targets while themselves under prolonged air attack. During the historic battle for Leyte Gulf, the *Santee* and her crew withstood successively, the first suicide plane attack of the war and a torpedo hit in her side while continuing flight operations and manning her antiaircraft guns.

The U.S.S. *Santee* and her crew served the people of the United States with valor and honor throughout World War II. The carrier and her courageous crew compiled an impressive combat record during her service in the battle theaters of the world. Their valiant action against enemy forces was crucial in our victory over the tyrannical Axis forces.

Each of us is indebted to these gallant men for their extraordinary heroism and devotion to duty.

VETERANS DAY

HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 10, 1995

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of our country's veterans. On Saturday, November 11, we will celebrate yet another Armistice Day, or as it is more commonly called today Veterans Day. This is a day when every American should stand together in remembrance, reflection, and gratitude to the men and women who have fought for our freedom, a freedom which has endured only through the enormous sacrifice of the veterans we remember today.

More than 1 million veterans did not return to the freedom of America. Countless other millions returned wounded in body or in spirit. To those soldiers and their families, I pledge today, that we will never forget your mighty tribute to our country.

And on the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month we will stand and salute the flag which our veterans carried with them to the wars, and which serves as a symbol of our national pride. At that moment, when the sirens sound, we must reflect on what kind of America we might live in today if not for the service of those who we honor each year on Armistice Day.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD.

VETERANS DAY, 1995

The threat to freedom and peace is no less sinister than in war. Our country's future must not go by default. The veteran must not fail the Nation's trust.—General Douglas MacArthur

Veterans Day marks the final day of the closing ceremonies of the 50th Anniversary of World War II. Although this day marks the conclusion of the official end of commemorations, we must never forget to honor the brave men and women who served in the war that changed our future forever.

Veterans Day provides us with an opportunity to remember and to acknowledge the sacrifice of men and women who have served their country in the Armed Forces of the United States. It is not a day of sadness, but in the truest sense, a day of reflection; a

day of commemoration; a day of honor; a day of celebration.

Veterans Day allows us to celebrate victory and the ultimate peace achieved on a myriad of battlefields around the world. Peace and victory have been earned with the blood of Americans who sacrificed their lives to preserve freedom and democracy. As terrible as that sacrifice is, nonetheless, it is the most divine of all human sentiments and the unconditional moral evolution of mankind.

Today, freedom enjoyed by us all is directly due to the sacrifice made by the American soldier, sailor, airman and Marine who was willing to fight and die for freedom.

He has engraved his imprint upon the souls of his countrymen. He has molded his statue in the hearts of all Americans. He has erected his monument in the memories of his comrades. His legacy has provided Americans with the highest example of patriotism. His testimonial has provided posterity with the foremost lessons of liberty and freedom. His recollection belongs to us by virtue of his achievements. His memorial belongs to the ages.

Our estimation of him was formed on the battlefields around the world and has never changed. We regard him today as we always have—our nation's enduring hero. He has written his own history in the annals of war in the blood of his enemy. The glory of his name is the legacy of every freedom loving man or woman who has ever lived or died on American soil.

We do not know the parable of his life. We do, however, know the nobility, the glory, and the significance of his death.

Men and women who have served their country in war need not be reminded of the high price of freedom. They, more than most, understand that freedom earned is always worth the price paid. That is our birthright; the legacy of America. That birthright, that legacy, and that heritage must never be taken for granted. The more difficult the struggle, the more glorious the victory.

Today, children must be taught the value of freedom and at what price their freedom was earned. They must be infused with the singular pride and privilege of being an American, and must be taught the deep sense of duty, honor and conviction conferred upon those of us fortunate enough to live in a free country.

Throughout the history of the United States, succeeding generations of Americans have always been inspired by the deeds, by the valor, and by the sacrifices made by American servicemen who served before them—giants in life and in death. Veterans Day is a gathering of generations, and a gathering of giants, and is the one day that solidifies generations of Americans.

On Veterans Day, a torch is passed from one generation to the other, and empowers us all to recollect and to express our gratitude for those who have served in wars past. The torch is subsequently passed along to our children and to our grandchildren, and burns brightly within the spirit and the soul of men and women destined to uphold the courageous tradition of American servicemen—patriots all who honorably served their country, not only in World War II, but to those who served in Korea and Vietnam, and whose 50th Anniversary will soon be upon us.

The American spirit has always been resolute and cannot be deterred, and is the determination which fires our consciousness through any endeavor, through any ordeal, through any conflict.

Servicemen and women have always been our nation's guardians, and have always pro-

tected and defended the sacred traditions entrusted to us by the Constitution. To paraphrase Winston Churchill in honoring British airmen, never has so much been owed, by so many, to so few.

If history has taught us anything, it is that the American serviceman will bear any hardship, will overcome any obstacle, and will conquer any foe in their quest for liberty, justice, and freedom.

As we conclude the commemoration ceremonies of the 50th Anniversary of the end of the war, it is fitting that we pay homage and acknowledge the World War II generation for their contribution to our nation. In a true sense, this generation had a rendezvous with destiny.

KEN SARO-WIWA

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 10, 1995

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked and gravely concerned about the outrageous death sentences handed down by the Nigerian military tribunal to Ken Saro-Wiwa and eight other Ogoni leaders.

The injustices committed by the Nigerian military dictatorship's special tribunal responsible for trying these men has been well documented by international human rights organizations and independent legal observers. This trial was conducted outside the regular court system and without consideration of the rights of the accused.

As cochairman of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus I have sent numerous letters to the Nigerian Government calling for justice in this case. This recent trial and verdict attests to the Nigerian Government's unwillingness to abide by international human right standards ensuring that their citizens are afforded due process. The environmental destruction and human rights abuse that has impacted the Ogoni people and their lands for more than 40 years must be stopped. If Ken Saro-Wiwa or any of the Ogoni leaders are executed, Congress will see to it that all ties with Nigeria, not only diplomatic, but all economic ties, are completely and permanently severed.

HONORING JOHN AND VIVIAN KING

HON. THOMAS M. DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 10, 1995

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to John and Vivian King, two people who have been helping their community and the children in northern Virginia for many years.

John King did not start out to do anything special when he started walking his granddaughter to school. But one day her teacher asked him to help in class and he agreed. At that time he had no idea that he would end up creating and running the school's safety program, assisting the counselor with the drug awareness program, and recruiting grandparent volunteers.

When Belvedere Elementary School in Falls Church, was undergoing extensive construction and remodeling, the need for a comprehensive safety program was evident. In addition, the safety of children going to and from school had been an increasing problem. Mr. King developed a safety program for kindergarten through sixth grade. He did not just go into the classrooms and talk, he created lesson plans which involved role playing and skits. He also used posters, charts, and questionnaires.

The "Just Say No" program has been highly successful as well. Using carefully prepared lessons, poster contests, guest speakers, and field trips, Mr. King has impressed upon every student the importance of keeping away from drugs. His programs have been such a success that he has been asked to take them to other elementary schools in northern Virginia. In addition to his work at the schools, Mr. King is very active in his church, where he is involved in CCD classes, and in the church's elementary school, where he helps with sex education classes and drug awareness classes.

During these many years of community involvement there has been one person who has been at John King's side is his wife of 50 years Vivian. Mrs. King has never been one to come into the spotlight, she prefers being behind the scenes. However, her acts of caring and kindness have never gone unnoticed. Mrs. King started making bookmarks for all of the children at Belvedere to encourage them to read. She was also ready with homemade cookies and cakes for special events. When Mr. King started the Red Ribbon program at Belvedere Elementary Mrs. King made sure that all of the ribbons had a pin fixed to them before being passed out to all of the children and teachers at school.

In addition to honoring their many years of community service, I know my colleagues join me in wishing John and Vivian a happy anniversary because the Kings celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary on October 29, 1995. The Kings are the proud parents of six children: Gary, Greg, Pamela, Joseph and John (twins), and Michael, who passed away in 1984.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in honoring John and Vivian King for all of their contributions to the elementary schools and community in northern Virginia. It is this kind of civic involvement and volunteer spirit that makes northern Virginia a great place to live.

TRIBUTE TO ALPHONSE STROOBANTS

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 10, 1995

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Al Stroobants for his dedication to serving his fellow citizens, both publicly through his professional career, and privately through the generous donation of \$3 million to his community hospital.

Mr. Stroobants is truly living the American dream. A victim of World War II, Mr.

Stroobants was forced to flee his homeland of Belgium with his sister and his parents when it was invaded by Nazi Germans. Escaping through the war zone, he remembers to this day the bombs exploding around him, and the smell of death.

He came to America in 1956, with \$55 in his pocket, and an education that ended when he was 13 years old. In 1962, he founded his own company, Belgium Tool & Die, with \$3,500 and two apprentices.

By 1990, sales of the company, which he has since sold, were \$25 million and Mr. Stroobants was able to sell his product in 35 countries.

To complete the American dream, Mr. Stroobants was able to give back to the community which embraced him and his success; the \$3 million gift to the Lynchburg General Hospital. His gift will help save lives, and will ensure the region has a high level of cardiac care. This new center, the Stroobants Heart Center of Virginia, includes cardiac catheterization laboratories, cardiovascular surgery, cardiovascular recovery unit, coronary care unit, cardiac diagnostic laboratories, nuclear cardiology, cardiac electrophysiology, and cardiopulmonary rehabilitation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you will join me in honoring this fine American and a true patriot.

THE WASTE OF THE UNINSURED

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 10, 1995

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are crowing today that they have discovered that the failed Clinton health care plan cost \$14 million to develop.

Yes, that was a waste. It should have been done differently, in the open, and with more congressional consultation.

Some \$14 million, Mr. Speaker. That's about the cost of care for 14 very premature babies that could have been prevented if people had health insurance. That's about the cost of 28 cancer cases that could have been detected earlier if people had health insurance.

Yesterday, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation estimated that the Republican Medicaid cuts would increase the number of uninsured by 50 percent. We already have 40 million uninsured. With their cuts it will rise to 68 million.

There is the true waste, Mr. Speaker. People will die; families will be destroyed; children will suffer because of the budget actions of the Republican majority. Some \$14 million was wasted—and it will be nothing, nothing, compared to the waste and death and pain that their budget bill will impose on the Nation.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY CONTROVERSY: WE NEED TO MOVE ON

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 10, 1995

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been a flurry of press articles concerning Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary and a DOE consulting contract involving Carma International and a so-called enemies list of the press.

I am attaching some factsheets concerning these issues. Hazel O'Leary has done a great job as Energy Secretary. While not condoning the Carma contract, we should look at all the facts before making any such judgments. The problem of the contract has been corrected and we need to move on.

The Wall Street Journal ran an article on Thursday, November 9, 1995, entitled "Turning the Tables, Energy Department Reports on Reporters."

The Journal article reports that DOE hired Carma International to compile an enemies list. This is simply not true.

The company, Carma International, was asked to provide quantitative and qualitative measurements of the Department's public affairs efforts to see if the Department was doing its job right.

The service purchased was a statistical analysis of the Department's news clips.

There exists nothing behind the numbers—it is only a survey of news written about the Department and its actions. These actions are sometimes controversial and media reports would reflect varied opinions.

The article led its readers to believe that the Department was "reporting on reporters"; the Department did nothing of the sort "poking around on reporters"; the Department did nothing of the sort.

The original focus on the Journal story was the tremendous growth in the media analysis business.

The tenor of the article regarding the investigating of individual journalists was used to describe some services provided by the industry—not Carma, Inc., nor the service provided to the Department.

It is this investigative side of the business—that the Department did not request, pay for, or receive—that has now unfairly become tar that has brushed the Department and the Secretary.

According to press reports, Carma's media analysis services have been retained by the Internal Revenue Service, the U.S. Postal Service, and the Republican National Committee.

FACT SHEET ON THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'S USE OF MEDIA ANALYSIS

Reports that the Department of Energy compiled an "enemies list" at taxpayers' expense are dead wrong.

In January 1995, the Department of Energy's Office of Public Affairs asked Carma International to evaluate the effectiveness of its public outreach efforts by performing a series of media analysis.

This effort was launched in response to the Secretary's pledge to make the Department

of Energy more open and responsive to the public, and to hold every program within the Department accountable to measurable standards of success.

The Carma analysis was an attempt to measure how the Office of Public Affairs was succeeding in earning the public trust—it was not intended as an analysis of the news coverage itself.

Between January and August 1995, Carma International gathered data. Carma analyzed items that appeared in newspapers, magazines, trade publications, wire services, and on television and radio, concerning the Department of Energy's activities around the country.

The firm took the unfortunate approach of characterizing stories, reporters and sources of information cited in the stories as "favorable" and "neutral." The firm then rated the top 25 "favorable" "unfavorable" and "neutral" sources of information regarding the Department. This was not a service requested by the Department of Energy.

After reviewing the reports prepared by Carma International, the Secretary determined that the information contained in them was neither useful as a measure of success, nor helpful in identifying areas for improvement in the Office of Public Affairs.

In August, the contract with Carma International was cancelled, at a total cost of about \$46,500.

The reports were never used or cited again until the Wall Street Journal published its story on today's front page.

Carma International never conducted any background investigations, or compiled any "enemies list."

The list of reporters and "unfavorable" sources cited in the Carma International report was never used in any way, shape or form by the Department of Energy.

THE FACTS

BACKGROUND

The Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (P.L. 103-62) requires that an annual performance plan be developed "covering each program activity set forth in the budget" of every government agency. Each performance plan must "establish performance indicators to be used in measuring or assessing the relevant outputs, service levels, and outcomes of each program activity."

Consistent with P.L. 103-62, all programs in the Department have developed strategic plans and metrics for measuring their performance.

The DOE Office of Public Affairs prepared a performance plan in consultation with a strategic planning group that included members of the trade associations, academia, interest groups, and DOE employees. This group was charged with identifying ways to measure and improve the Department's communication with the public.

The strategic planning group recommended that the Department prepare a media analysis to track its performance in public communication of the complex issues and missions of the Department of Energy.

As a first step, the DOE Office of Public Affairs assessed the cost of performing the recommended media analysis inside DOE. The cost of such an assessment was determined to be \$170,000.

The Office of Public Affairs determined that the task could be performed by a contractor more effectively and for less money. The Office examined private sector options.

In January 1995, the Office of Public Affairs purchased the services of the Carma International company.

Carma International was paid \$46,500 for the service that they provided from January to August 1995.

The company provided seven reports to the Office of Public Affairs.

THE CARMA SERVICE

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the DOE Office of Public Affairs, Carma International was asked to provide quantitative and qualitative measurements.

The purpose was to allow the Department to better understand whether the products of the DOE Office of Public Affairs were useful and informative to reporters and the public.

The goal was to improve the quality of information made available about a broad range of Departmental activities.

The purchase order for the Carma services requested that the company "analyze" media stores "to determine what message is getting out to the public." It also requested that the company provide input on whether [the information is being presented in a favorable or unfavorable manner.]

In discharging their responsibilities under the purchase order, Carma characterized reporters' and sources as "favorable, unfavorable, or neutral."

The product that resulted from Carma was a monthly report. Seven of these reports were provided to the DOE Office of Public Affairs.

The reports included a narrative summary of DOE issues covered by the media, an overview of the most frequently addressed issues, and an assessment and a favorability rating on the issues, messages and sources.

The criteria for evaluating favorability was whether the coverage presented the Department as living up to its promises and commitments. Key Departmental promises and commitments included open access, wise planning for the handling of nuclear waste, and responsible management of DOE programs.

Carma was not authorized under the scope of work of the DOE to investigate, rate, rank or score reporters and it did not do so. No investigative work was conducted under the terms of this contract.

The President of Carma, Albert Borr, has stated that Carma is "not an investigative service."

The contract was terminated in August 1995.

UTILIZATION OF THE MEDIA SURVEYS

The seven reports presented to the Department by Carma between January and August 1995) were read by a limited number of people at the Department of Energy.

Secretary O'Leary was provided with some of the reports. She recalls having seen two of the reports and did not believe they were particularly helpful.

The information in the reports was never used by the Secretary or by any other official in the Department either to provide preferential treatment to a reporter, newspaper, or source or to deny access.

The Department's policy of openness has ensured that reporters, media outlets, and sources have full and open access to announcements and information concerning DOE programs.

MARATHON MAN'S SPIRIT WITH US STILL

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 10, 1995

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, the 26th New York City marathon, directed by New York Road Runners Club president Allan Steinfeld, will be run on Sunday. The marathon and the club are the best and most important in the world, and both are the legacy of Fred Lebow. Fred created the marathon in 1970 and remained its leader and guiding spirit until his death from cancer last fall.

As one who has run the New York City marathon, I can attest that the excitement it generates brings the entire city together. There's no better way to see New York City than to run through all five boroughs and savor the variety of their celebrations.

Today's Daily News contains an article by Allan Steinfeld about the marathon, the Road Runners Club and its activities, the progress during the past year, and the anticipation of Sunday's marathon. But, mostly Allan's article is a tribute to Fred, whose name and memory will always be part of the marathon, and whose life the marathon will always celebrate.

Mr. Speaker, the Daily News article follows. I urge my colleagues to read it and reflect on how one remarkable man improved the lives of thousands of individuals and an entire city.

MARATHON MAN'S SPIRIT WITH US STILL

(By Allan Steinfeld)

Fred Lebow will always be a civic treasure in this city, and a treasure to me personally. He created New York's greatest annual athletic event, the New York City Marathon, which this Sunday—and always—will be a celebration of his life.

This past year, since Fred's death Oct. 9, 1994, after a 4½-year battle with brain cancer, has been both exciting and difficult for me. Difficult because Fred is gone—though his presence often seems with us. I think of him every day, especially as we approach the 26th New York City Marathon.

The Marathon, which I am directing this year, has two different meanings for me. First, I want to continue the legacy Fred began in 1970. Second—and this meant a great deal to Fred—this event brings the entire city together in a way no other can.

It is a celebration and an affirmation of life. It feels good to enable more than 27,000 people to have this wonderful experience—one that will change the lives of many of them. And it makes me happy that the Marathon brings approximately \$100 million into the city.

LIFE AND RUNNING

My life changed when I began running in 1963. I had never been good at sports. I was skinny and short, with lousy hand-eye coordination. I was a terrible baseball player; when we were chosen for games in the schoolyard, I was always the last choice. At least in football there was some hesitancy by the captains since I was fast and an asset on defense—I could get there quickly and jump well. But on offense I couldn't catch the ball. In basketball I could play defense, block shots and steal, but couldn't dribble and shoot.

In 1963 I went to college, Hunter and then City, and had the opportunity to run track.

It changed my life and self-image. I started to see myself as capable and physical, not just cerebral.

Here was something I could excel at.

Now, as president of the New York Road Runners Club, I'm in the position to foster its continued growth—not growth for its own sake, but because it improves the lives of our members.

The NYRRRC went from 30,000 to 34,000 members this past year, keeping us the world's No. 1 running organization. It was our biggest increase in more than a decade. Fred would be very pleased. He would be happy about all of our corporate sponsors; he knew they were necessary to keep the Marathon and road running growing.

Celebration is the word I always associated with the Marathon and Fred. New Yorkers celebrate by running and watching this event. And we are building upon the foundation Fred created.

Our not-for-profit organization is involved in a great deal of community activity; we plan to expand in that area. We would like to get more women and families involved in our health and fitness programs. We sponsor, along with Asphalt Green on the East Side, the City-Sports for Kids Program, which serves some 2,000 boys and girls and includes basketball and track and field. We sponsor a Junior Road Runner Club Series—non-competitive races for youngsters, and provide Group Safety Runs, "safety pairing" for runners throughout the city and a Central Park Safety Patrol and Park Care program.

FRIEND & HERO

Fred was a legend in running, but he was also my best friend. We began working together in 1976; that's a lot of years.

One of the greatest moments of my life came when, in June 1990, Fred and I ran a victory lap around the Central Park reservoir after an MRI showed that chemotherapy had begun to shrink the lymphoma in his brain. We needed to run together, and Fred ran the best time he had in about a year.

Fred turned New York's Marathon into the world's best—what he always said he wanted it to be. Cancer may have taken him, but he lives on in the Marathon, his cherished creation.

STATEMENT FOR THE RECORD

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 10, 1995

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce two temporary duty suspension bills. It is my understanding that they are noncontroversial. I am introducing these on behalf of AgrEvo, a company located in my home State of Delaware whose business is strictly limited to the manufacture, distribution, and sale of proprietary patented agricultural products to American farmers. These bills will assist the company's overall competitive posture by lowering its cost of doing business. Further, duty exemption legislation will enable the company to maintain a stable and growing work force.

I realize there are serious budgetary and other constraints impeding the progress of such duty exemption bills, but by formally introducing such legislation we can begin to create the necessary visibility and interest within the U.S. trade community and their European

counterparts so that these issues can be negotiated. The administration has the authority to forward specific tariff reductions to the World Trade Organization to facilitate the adoption of chemical tariffs at lower levels. By allowing other countries to participate in the World Trade Organization to harmonize chemical tariff agreements, the administration would be able to address the growing demand for new duty suspensions on chemical products by utilizing existing tariff proclamation authority.

This legislation would benefit American businesses, workers, and our farmers. It is my hope that these duty suspension issues can be resolved.

INDIVIDUALISM AND COMPASSION

HON. KAREN MCCARTHY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 10, 1995

Ms. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues a most thoughtful and insightful article by Dr. Wallace B. Smith, president of the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. I am proud to say that the church is headquartered in Independence, MO—the heart of my congressional district. Under the stewardship of Dr. Smith, who has served as president for 20 years, the church has carried out its mission of spreading peace and harmony throughout our community and the world. The church's temple, an architectural wonder, rises like a beacon and serves as an eternal reminder of the powerful spiritual presence we are so fortunate to have in our community. The compassion and concern the members of the church have for mankind is perhaps best illustrated in the following article, which I commend to the attention of my colleagues and ask that it be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From The Saints Herald, Feb. 1995]

INDIVIDUALISM AND COMPASSION

(By Wallace B. Smith)

The rhetoric of some politicians these days seems to be echoing a deep-felt mood among many citizens that ought to be troubling for followers of Jesus Christ.

The mood is not unique to any specific people, race, ethnic group, or nationality, although it was manifested rather widely in the United States during and subsequent to the November 1994 elections. Much was said about a seeming desire for change on the part of the electorate, and change was certainly reflected in the election results. There was a desire, it was said, to make government more responsive to the people—if necessary, by replacing the current political office holders with new, albeit untested, ones.

This desire has now been accomplished and has been interpreted by some as mandating a change in the social agenda as well. Indeed, the conservative philosophy of less dependence on government, more individual initiative, and increased self-reliance has been on the rise. Unfortunately, such seemingly desirable societal traits can also be viewed as "code words" that encourage the needs of the poor to be ignored, individual freedom to become license, the self systematically exalted, and injustice against the weak and the powerless fostered.

These latter qualities, which are manifestations of the sin of self-centeredness, are the very characteristics Jesus consistently pointed out to his disciples as those to be guarded against. That is why such traits, when they begin to be a reflective of the mood of a nation or a people, should give followers of Jesus Christ cause for concern.

Whether we who live in the United States of America are experiencing such a mood just now is a question that needs to be explored in light of some pertinent information. A publication from Bread for the World recently called attention to the Personal Responsibility Act being advocated by some U.S. congressional leaders. This act lumps the Women, Infants and Children (WIC) program; food stamps; and school lunches in with other general welfare reforms in such a way that they are reduced three times as much as they were in the early 1980s.

At the same time, according to Bread for the World, these congressional leaders are calling on the religious community to assume more responsibility to assist people in need. If the approximately 350,000 churches in the United States were all to assist equally in this task, each would need to give \$170,000 to make up the \$60 billion in funding it is said the passage of the Personal Responsibility Act would save the government over a four-year period. Such a response is a practical impossibility.

Even more at risk are programs that help hungry people worldwide. All foreign aid represents only about 1 percent of the U.S. federal budget, and only about one-third of that goes to programs focused on reducing poverty and promoting sustainable development. Yet foreign aid will probably be cut another 25 percent in the coming year, and the poor and the hungry will be affected the most.

It is important to realize these are not just partisan political issues. Members of Congress from both political parties feel tremendous pressure to be responsive to their constituents. These are people, many of them staunch churchgoers, who are telling their governmental representatives to cut programs that assist poor people, homeless people, people without sufficient food and basic necessities.

Why would they do that?

Perhaps some truly believe that the moral values that link personal responsibility with social change are presently missing among a large number of society's poor and disadvantaged. But, as Jim Wallis points out in *Sojourners*, "to call for self-improvement and a return to family values while ignoring the pernicious effects of poverty, racism, and sexism is to continue blaming the victim" (September-October 1994, page 16).

Perhaps what is needed most in this time of societal discontent is a willingness to take more responsibility for our own lives, to live more simply, but also to be more willing to take action on behalf of those whom Jesus calls to our attention as most worthy of our concern. For, as we are reminded in Matthew 25: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory . . . then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me; . . . Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF STEVE CULLEN

HON. THOMAS M. BARRETT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 10, 1995

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the memory of one of Wisconsin's finest public servants, my good friend and colleague Steve Cullen.

Steve Cullen dedicated his life to the betterment of the city of Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin. A graduate of Milwaukee's Washington High School and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Steve served on the Milwaukee Common Council for 12 years. He was a tireless public advocate who was not afraid to fight for his constituents. Steve's accomplishments are great. He will long be remembered for his successful efforts to bring cable television to Milwaukee, his drive to reform and reorganize city government, and his leadership and expertise on budget matters. When Steve tackled a project, no matter how challenging, he did so with enthusiasm, vigor, and integrity.

Steve will also be remembered for his boisterous personality and sense of humor. Steve brought laughter and joy into every room he entered, and could brighten your day like no one else.

Above all else, Steve Cullen was a devoted father and loving husband. Those who knew Steve well understood that the time he spent with his beautiful daughters Annie, Kathleen, Molly, and Colleen, and his wife Gael were the greatest times of his life. I'm sure that his daughters will always remember what a caring and giving man their father was.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Steve Cullen. And I join with the city of Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin in mourning the loss of an outstanding citizen and friend.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO FATHER GEORGE F. RILEY

HON. THOMAS J. MANTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 10, 1995

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish a happy 60th birthday to Father George F. Riley. It is rare to meet a man who is so dedicated to his community.

A native of Massachusetts, Father Riley has been an important part of the Villanova community for the past 35 years where he currently serves as the special assistant to the president of the university. In this position he is responsible for assisting the development and maintenance of a strong communication network between Villanova and the more than 75,000 alumni around the world.

Father Riley's positions in the field of teaching and administration is impressive. His positions include campus Peace Corps Director; provincial secretary; archivist and vocation director of the Augustine Order which conducts Villanova and national director of the alumni

fund. He also served for 21 years as vice president of university development. During his tenure he raised over \$83 million in grants and gifts for Villanova University.

In addition to his many works at Villanova University, Father Riley is involved in a number of other organizations. These include; a trustee emeritus of Merrimack College in Andover, MA, a commissioner at the Pennsylvania Public Television Network Commission; member of the board of directors of the Higher

Education Congress of Philadelphia, and the United Way.

Mr. Speaker, Father Riley has also been the recipient of several awards and honors. These awards include "Man of the Year" by the Hebrew Academy of Atlantic County, NJ; the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of the State of New Jersey; the Italian Press Club of Philadelphia; the Distinguished Community Service Award by the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey; the

Rafter Football Memorial Award as well as Philadelphia's prestigious Commodore John Barry Award by the American Catholic Historical Society.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in wishing Father George F. Riley a very happy 80th birthday with many more in the future. Father Riley is an illustrative individual dedicated to his church, education organizations and community.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to share with my colleagues a brief biography and a tribute to a man who has been a great blessing to the State of New Jersey. I am proud to say that Father Riley is a member of the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Italian Press Club of Philadelphia, the Distinguished Community Service Award by the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Rafter Football Memorial Award as well as Philadelphia's prestigious Commodore John Barry Award by the American Catholic Historical Society.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that Father Riley is a member of the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Italian Press Club of Philadelphia, the Distinguished Community Service Award by the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Rafter Football Memorial Award as well as Philadelphia's prestigious Commodore John Barry Award by the American Catholic Historical Society.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that Father Riley is a member of the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Italian Press Club of Philadelphia, the Distinguished Community Service Award by the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Rafter Football Memorial Award as well as Philadelphia's prestigious Commodore John Barry Award by the American Catholic Historical Society.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that Father Riley is a member of the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Italian Press Club of Philadelphia, the Distinguished Community Service Award by the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Rafter Football Memorial Award as well as Philadelphia's prestigious Commodore John Barry Award by the American Catholic Historical Society.

HON. THOMAS J. MANTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 10, 1995

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I now bring to the floor a bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to provide for the creation of a new Federal Reserve Bank in the State of New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that Father Riley is a member of the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Italian Press Club of Philadelphia, the Distinguished Community Service Award by the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Rafter Football Memorial Award as well as Philadelphia's prestigious Commodore John Barry Award by the American Catholic Historical Society.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that Father Riley is a member of the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Italian Press Club of Philadelphia, the Distinguished Community Service Award by the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Rafter Football Memorial Award as well as Philadelphia's prestigious Commodore John Barry Award by the American Catholic Historical Society.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that Father Riley is a member of the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Italian Press Club of Philadelphia, the Distinguished Community Service Award by the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Rafter Football Memorial Award as well as Philadelphia's prestigious Commodore John Barry Award by the American Catholic Historical Society.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that Father Riley is a member of the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Italian Press Club of Philadelphia, the Distinguished Community Service Award by the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Rafter Football Memorial Award as well as Philadelphia's prestigious Commodore John Barry Award by the American Catholic Historical Society.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that Father Riley is a member of the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Italian Press Club of Philadelphia, the Distinguished Community Service Award by the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Rafter Football Memorial Award as well as Philadelphia's prestigious Commodore John Barry Award by the American Catholic Historical Society.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that Father Riley is a member of the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Italian Press Club of Philadelphia, the Distinguished Community Service Award by the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Rafter Football Memorial Award as well as Philadelphia's prestigious Commodore John Barry Award by the American Catholic Historical Society.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that Father Riley is a member of the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Italian Press Club of Philadelphia, the Distinguished Community Service Award by the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Rafter Football Memorial Award as well as Philadelphia's prestigious Commodore John Barry Award by the American Catholic Historical Society.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that Father Riley is a member of the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Italian Press Club of Philadelphia, the Distinguished Community Service Award by the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Rafter Football Memorial Award as well as Philadelphia's prestigious Commodore John Barry Award by the American Catholic Historical Society.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that Father Riley is a member of the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Italian Press Club of Philadelphia, the Distinguished Community Service Award by the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Rafter Football Memorial Award as well as Philadelphia's prestigious Commodore John Barry Award by the American Catholic Historical Society.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that Father Riley is a member of the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Italian Press Club of Philadelphia, the Distinguished Community Service Award by the B'nai B'rith of New Jersey, the Rafter Football Memorial Award as well as Philadelphia's prestigious Commodore John Barry Award by the American Catholic Historical Society.